DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 079 EC 309 049

AUTHOR	Nover, Stephen M.; Andrews, Jean F.; Everhart, Vicki S.
TITLE	Critical Pedagogy in Deaf Education: Teachers' Reflections on Implementing ASL/English Bilingual Methodology and Language Assessment for Deaf Learners. Year 4 Report (2000-2001). USDLC Star Schools Project Report.
INSTITUTION	New Mexico School for the Deaf, Santa Fe.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	USDLC-R-4
PUB DATE	2001-09-30
NOTE	120p.; For the Year 3 Report, see ED 450 534.
CONTRACT	R203A970030-00
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*American Sign Language; Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education Programs; Bilingual Students; *Cross Cultural Training; *Deafness; Distance Education; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Internet; Language Acquisition; Multicultural Education; Student Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Response; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Bilingual Bicultural Model; Star Schools

ABSTRACT

The Star School staff of the Engaged Learners project at the New Mexico School for the Deaf in Santa Fe has completed its fourth year of a 5-year federally-funded program. This project aims to improve language-teaching practices of teachers who work with learners who are deaf by providing training in current bilingual theories and pedagogical techniques, including Engaged Learning practices, through a convergence of Internet, Web, and distance learning technologies. The project promotes proficiency in American Sign Language (ASL) and English for all students based on the belief that bilingualism enhances cognitive, social, and linguistic growth. This publication describes the projects fourth year activities and the overall project impact. Information is provided on: (1) participating teachers and mentors; (2) training materials; (3) teachers experimentation with ASL/English bilingual assessment for students with deafness and teachers written reflections on the training; (3) teachers utilization of technology while using ASL and English; (4) plans to refine and revise the staff development model in the projects fifth year; and (6) the establishment of the Center for ASL/English Bilingual Education and Research. More than 163 teachers and over 500 students participated during the first 4 years of the project. (CR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 079

USDLC
Star Schools Project Report No. 4
The Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U. S. Department of Education
Grant Number: R203A970030-00

Year Four 2000 - 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Critical Pedagogy in Deaf Education:

Teachers' Reflections on Implementing ASL/English Bilingual Methodology and Language Assessment for Deaf Learners

Stephen M. Nover, Project Director

EC 309049

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

USDLC Star Schools Project Report No. 4

YEAR 4 REPORT (2000-2001)

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY
IN
DEAF EDUCATION:

TEACHERS' REFLECTIONS ON IMPLEMENTING ASL/ENGLISH BILINGUAL METHODOLOGY AND LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT FOR DEAF LEARNERS

Stephen M. Nover, Ph.D.
New Mexico School for the Deaf

Jean F. Andrews, Ph.D.
Lamar University

Vicki S. Everhart, Ph.D.
New Mexico School for the Deaf

September 30, 2001

©2001 by New Mexico School for the Deaf

All rights reserved
The United Star Distance Learning Consortium, Inc. (USDLC) Star Schools Project is pleased to disseminate the information and perspectives contained in this report. The findings, conclusions, and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of USDLC or the New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, Illinois, or Eastern North Carolina Schools for the Deaf.

Copyright 2001, New Mexico School for the Deaf
Santa Fe, New Mexico
All rights reserved.
ISBN 0-9668769-4-6

This report may be copied for limited distribution. To receive the first year (1997-1998) report, the second-year (1998-1999) report, the third-year (1999-2000) report or additional copies of this (2000-2001) document, please see www.starschools.org/nmsd.

Stephen M. Nover, Center for ASL/English Bilingual Education and Research Director
New Mexico School for the Deaf
1060 Cerrillos Road
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
V/TDD: (505) 827-6739
FAX: (505) 827-6684
E-Mail: steve.nover@nmsd.k12.nm.us

Cover Design: Center for the Application of Information Technologies at Western Illinois University

First Printing, 500 Copies
Printed in the United States of America

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under Grant Number R203A970030-00. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department of Education, or any other agency of the U.S. government.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Summary / 1
- Project Impact / 2
- Project Activities Over Four Years: 1997-2001 / 3
- Summer Intensive ASL/English Bilingual Mentor Training / 6

Overview / 8
- Assessment of Deaf Bilinguals / 9
- ASL Assessment / 10
- Dissatisfaction with Current Assessment Methods / 11
- Challenges of Assessing Language / 14
- Sociocultural Approach to Assessment / 17

Methodology / 18
- Backgrounds of the Teachers / 18
- Data Collection / 19
- The Context / 20

Teacher Reflections / 21
- Level 3: Bilingual Assessment and Methodologies / 21
- Summary of Level 3 Training / 45
- Level 4: The Application of Bilingual Strategies and Assessments / 46
- Summary of Level 4 Training /72

Teachers' Use of Technology / 72
- How Technology Enhances ASL/English Bilingual Classrooms / 75

Final Note on the Impact of the Star Schools Project / 77

Appendices
A. Syllabus for Level 1 / 81
B. Syllabus for Level 2 / 88
C. Syllabus for Level 3 / 95
D. Syllabus for Level 4 / 100

References /108

List of Tables

1. The Development and Refinement of Levels 1- 4 of the ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Training (1997-2001) / 4
2. Background Variables of the Mentors and Teachers Participating in Year 4 of the Star Schools Training / 19

Acknowledgments

Much our work on the Star Schools Project and in the schools for the deaf would not have been possible without the financial support of the Western Illinois University through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, the U.S. Department of Education, and the efforts of the project staff, school administrators, and participating teachers. Donna Keller, Mindy Bradford, and JoAnn Hurley have provided insightful suggestions to improve the quality of the Star Schools' Fourth-Year Report. Although they are not responsible for the contents of the report, their contributions are gratefully acknowledged. The following schools and individuals comprise the fourth year participants in the Star Schools project.

New Mexico School for the Deaf Star Schools Project Staff

Dr. Stephen M. Nover, Project Director	Dr. Vicki Everhart, Assistant Project Director	Ms. Mindy Bradford, Document Development Coordinator
Ms. Donna Keller, ASL/English Bilingual Resource Specialist	Ms. Jennifer Montano, Secretary	

School Administrators

New Mexico School for the Deaf Mr. Ron Stern, Superintendent	**Texas School for the Deaf** Ms. Claire Bugen, Superintendent
Kansas School for the Deaf Mr. Gerald Johnson, Superintendent	**Illinois School for the Deaf** Ms. Joan Forney, Superintendent
Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf Dr. Thomasine Hardy, Director	

Participating Teachers (Levels 3 and 4)

New Mexico School for the Deaf (NMSD) (Levels 3 & 4)	**Texas School for the Deaf (TSD) (Levels 3 & 4)**
Dr. Vicki Everhart Mentor	Ms. Betty Bounds, Mentor
Ms. Kathy Glyer, Mentor	Ms. Avonne Brooker-Rutowski, Mentor
Ms. Mary Martone, Mentor	Ms. Kim Jennifer Hamilton, Mentor
Ms. Carla Garcia	Mr. Gary Stein
Ms. Jennifer Herbold	Ms. Donna Altuna
Ms. Carrie Nichols	Ms. Joey Austin
Ms. Pamela Martinez	Ms. Sandra Kimball
Ms. Shelly Milliorn	Ms. Marie Dickinson
Ms. Natalie Williams	

Kansas School for the Deaf (KSD) **(Levels 3 & 4)** Ms. Nancy Eades, Mentor Ms. Sandie Kelly, Mentor Ms. Luanne Ward, Mentor Ms. Carol Busch Ms. Julie Conradi Ms. Anne Drake Ms. Lori Earls Mr. Larry Finn Ms. Donna Heincker	**Illinois School for the Deaf (ISD)** **(Levels 3 & 4)** Ms. Mary Anderson, Mentor Ms. Paula Chance, Mentor Ms. Nancy Kelly-Jones, Mentor Ms. Kathryn Surbeck, Mentor Ms. Colleen Keithley Ms. Angie Titus-Hughes Ms. Kathryn Mansell Ms. Aimee Vieth Ms. Barb Ward
Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf (Levels 3 & 4) Ms. Cindy Decker-Pickell, Mentor Mr. Steve Witchey, Mentor Ms. Kara Baldwin Ms. Kim Hutchens Ms. Sue Weber Ms. Diane Wright	
Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf (Levels 1 & 2) Ms. Cindy Decker-Pickell, Mentor Mr. Steve Witchey, Mentor Ms. Patricia Cloyd Ms. Sarah Daniels Ms. Anne Mercer Ms. Randi Pakula Ms. Vicki Robertson Ms. Laurie Rook Ms. Angela White	**Texas School for the Deaf** **(Levels 1 & 2)** Ms. Avonne Brooker-Rutowski, Mentor Ms. Johnett Scogin, Mentor Ms. Betty Bounds, Mentor Ms. Lucy Brotherton Ms. Christine Costello Ms. Christine Kane Ms. Cindy Hamilton Ms. Susan Huddleson Ms. Rose McCorkle Ms. Terry Robbins Ms. Anne Duke-Shaw Ms. Debbie White

Critical Pedagogy in Deaf Education:

Issues in ASL/English Bilingual Assessment and Methodologies

Year 4 Report: 2000-2001

Summary

The Star Schools staff of the "Engaged Learners" project (1997-2002), centrally located at the Center for ASL/English Bilingual Education and Research (CAEBER) at the New Mexico School for the Deaf (NMSD) in Santa Fe, has completed its fourth year of a five-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education under the United Star Distance Learning Consortium (USDLC) Star Schools Project. This project aims to improve language teaching practices of teachers who work with deaf learners by providing training in current bilingual theories and pedagogical techniques, including "Engaged Learning" practices, through a convergence of Internet, web, and distance learning technologies. Throughout our four years of work, our activities have been guided by two principles:

1. Deaf bilingual students are given equal opportunity to learn the same challenging content and acquire skill levels that are recommended for all students.
2. Proficiency in American Sign Language (ASL) and English is promoted for all deaf students because bilingualism enhances cognitive, social, and linguistic growth, as well as our understanding of diverse multicultural groups in the Deaf and Hearing cultures.

Our principles represent a different perspective than the medical or "pathological" model that focuses solely on "fixing" deafness through amplification, implant surgery, and aural habilitation and rehabilitation. Although we do not dismiss the importance of auditory surgery and technology in improving the lives of some, *we cannot overemphasize the importance of visual learning in the language lives of deaf persons* (Chamberlain, Morford, & Mayberry, 2000). Historically, professionals in the deaf education field have

engaged in debates on which communication methodology (e.g., oral/aural, combined methods) is the best (Knight & Swanwick, 1999; Lane, Hoffmeister, & Bahan, 1996; Easterbrooks & Baker, 2002; Moores, 2000; Nover, 2000). In these debates, a central idea has often been undervalued: deaf students grow up to be deaf adults who live and work in diverse, bilingual communities of hearing and deaf persons using ASL and many varieties of English (e.g., Manually Coded English, Cued Speech, oral) (Grosjean, 1998). Consequently, we think a more promising direction for schools is to focus on enhancing teacher instructional practices and student academic achievement through the *early use* of two languages and two cultures to prepare deaf students for full access and integration into both worlds—Deaf and Hearing (Nover & Andrews, 1998, 2000, 2001).

Project Impact

What follows are descriptions of our fourth-year activities and our overall project impact.

1. We describe the backgrounds of participating teachers and mentors.
2. We document our training materials: syllabi, readings, and reflective log questions (see Appendices A-D).
3. We discuss how teachers experimented with ASL/English bilingual assessments for deaf students and document teachers' written reflections on what they learned through Levels 3 and 4 of the Star Schools training.
4. We describe the teachers' utilization of technology while using ASL and English.
5. We discuss our plans to refine and revise our "ASL/English Bilingual Professional Staff Development Model" in the fifth year of the project based on our four years of work.
6. We describe how we have established *The Center for ASL/English Bilingual Education and Research (CAEBER)* at the New Mexico School for the Deaf to conduct and house this project and continue its work after the grants terminate.

In our "ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Model," we study such topics as bilingualism, Deaf culture, ASL, and technology and create a deaf and hearing community of learners that changes teachers' traditional beliefs about how deaf students acquire, learn, and use two languages—ASL and English. The Star Schools Project (1997-2002) has impacted participants in nine residential schools for the deaf. Our project has also impacted university teacher-training programs (Star Online Project, 2000-2005) and thus has influenced how teachers are educated. The project has built a community of learners in which universities and schools for the deaf share resources on bilingual education, Deaf culture, ASL, and technology with mainstream programs. We think other disciplines can use the framework of our model to address their own issues, as well.

Project Activities Over Four Years: 1997 - 2001

From 1997 to 2001, we collaborated with teachers and mentors from nine residential schools for the deaf. The participating schools for the deaf were New Mexico School for the Deaf (NMSD), Texas School for the Deaf (TSD), Kansas School for the Deaf (KSD), Illinois School for the Deaf (ISD), Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf (ENCSD), Kentucky School for the Deaf (KySD), Indiana School for the Deaf (InSD), Kendall Demonstration Elementary School (KDES) in Washington, DC, and Alabama School for the Deaf (ASD).[1] More than 163 teachers have participated and over 500 students have been impacted during the first four years of the project (see Table 1 for school participation).

[1] The abbreviations used here for the Kentucky School for the Deaf (KySD) and the Indiana School for the Deaf (InSD) were created by project staff to prevent confusion with other participating schools.

Table 1: The Development and Refinement of Levels 1- 4 of the ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Training (1997-2001).

Year 1 1997-98	Year 2 1998-99	Year 3 1999-00	Year 4 2000-01	Year 5 2001-02
1st group: Levels 1 & 2 (NMSD, TSD)	1st group: Levels 3 & 4 (NMSD, TSD) 2nd group: Levels 1 & 2 (KSD)	2nd group: Levels 3 & 4 (KSD) 3rd group: Levels 1 & 2 (NMSD, TSD, KSD, ISD, ENCSD) Summer Mentor Workgroup—revised Levels 1 & 2	4th group: Levels 1 & 2 (TSD, ENCSD) 3rd group: Levels 3 & 4 (NMSD, TSD, KSD, ISD, ENCSD) Summer Mentor Workgroup—revised Levels 3 & 4 Mentor Training—Four schools' mentors received training in Levels 1 & 2 (KDES, KySD, InSD, & ASD)	4th group: Levels 3 & 4 (TSD) 5th group: Levels 1 & 2 (NMSD, ISD, KSD, InSD, ASD, KDES, & KySD) Data collection on background variables and SAT scores Mentor Training—Four schools' mentors will receive training in Levels 3 & 4 (KDES, KySD, InSD & ASD) Mentor Training—Five new schools' mentors will receive training in Levels 1 & 2

In the complete five years of the project, teachers and staff from nine schools for the deaf will have participated in the inservice education. In addition, we plan to train new mentors from five additional schools for the deaf to start the inservice education at their schools. It is important to note that the original grant proposal planned to implement the ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development inservice in only five schools. As a result of high

interest in the field, other schools have contacted us and expressed interest in involvement. It also should be noted that eight of the nine participating schools shared in partial or total costs of the inservice education for the teachers and staff. This is an important point because it shows that the inservice education has become institutionalized at participating schools for the deaf, with NMSD as the lead agency providing Bilingual Education mentor training in the summers and meetings/workshops throughout the year.

In Year 1 (1997-98), the Star Schools project staff in collaboration with two schools for the deaf (NMSD and TSD) developed the ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Model based on theories of bilingualism, first and second language acquisition, language and literacy development, and bilingual assessment. The staff development is comprised of four levels or four semesters of training (see Appendices A, B, C, and D for the syllabus for each level).

- Appendix A - Level 1: Bilingual Theories and Practices I
- Appendix B - Level 2: Bilingual Theories and Practices II
- Appendix C - Level 3: Bilingual Assessment and Methodologies I
- Appendix D - Level 4: Application of Bilingual Strategies and Assessment

During the first year (1997-98), 17 teachers from the NMSD and TSD participated in Levels 1 and 2. In Year 2 (1998-99), they continued to apply, refine, and develop the ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Model. In short, the teachers from the first year who completed Levels 1 and 2 then took Levels 3 and 4 of the training. In the second year, a new group of eight teachers from KSD participated in Levels 1 and 2 of the training. In addition, teachers began to use different kinds of technology to teach ASL and English. In

Year 3 (1999-2000), new groups of 36 teachers from ISD, ENSCD, NMSD, TSD, and KSD participated in Levels 1 and 2. KSD teachers who had completed Levels 1 and 2 in Year 2 of the project took Levels 3 and 4. In Year 4 (2000-2001), new groups of 15 teachers from TSD and ENCSD participated in Levels 1 and 2 while NMSD, TSD, KSD, ISD, and ENSCD teachers continued their staff development by taking Levels 3 and 4 (see Table 1). Teachers continued to use technology for teaching ASL and English.

Summer Intensive ASL/English Bilingual Mentor Training

As an innovation to the project, at the end of Year 4 in June of 2001, the project staff provided a Summer Intensive ASL/English Bilingual Mentor Training program to school staff who would become "mentors" for four new participating schools: KySD, InSD, KDES and ASD. The purpose of the summer training was to prepare these new mentors to implement Levels 1 and 2 at their schools starting in Fall 2001. Until this time, the project had provided no mentor pre-training. Based on our experiences after four years of the project, we determined that it would be useful to provide an annual summer intensive training for new mentors from new participating schools. In our summer intensive training, university teacher-educators teamed with experienced Star School mentors to lead and facilitate the training. We found this collaboration to be most productive. It provided many new insights as professors and K-12 teachers shared their perspectives as they grew in their knowledge of bilingual education for deaf students.

The Summer Intensive ASL/English Bilingual Mentor Training consisted of two full weeks of learning the content of Levels 1 and 2. Using the critical pedagogy process, the participants surveyed and reflected upon current research in bilingual/bicultural education

and how it applied to deaf education. Level 1 topics included viewing deaf learners as bilingual and bicultural; programs, models, and techniques of bilingual and ESL (English as a second language) approaches; and learner-centered classroom instruction. Level 2 topics included learning about deaf learners' rights to bilingual education, the politics of bilingualism in deaf education, and language planning in the classroom. Participants also explored the use of classroom technology that could be used to promote language acquisition, language learning, ASL development and proficiency, and English literacy through bilingual strategies. Participants learned about various interactive software programs and applications, current technology equipment such as SMARTBoards, digital cameras, digital camcorders, and "In Focus" and other LCD projectors. During the two-week training, participants also learned about mentors' responsibilities such as establishing the staff development at their school, facilitating staff development seminars, collecting and compiling data, mentorship, and peer support. (See www.starschools.org/nmsd for Summer Training Brochure.)

In the Summer of 2002, the Star Schools project will host another Star Schools Summer Intensive ASL/English Bilingual Mentor Training so that the mentors from the new schools can learn the content of Levels 3 and 4. Technology and mentor training will also be included. In addition, we will provide Summer Intensive ASL/English Bilingual Mentor Training of Levels 1 and 2 to school staff who will become mentors for five additional schools for the deaf.

It is important to note that our ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Model with its four levels of training and summer intensive mentor training has gone through numerous revisions as different groups of teachers used it. Although the project staff

initiated and generated the first draft of Levels 1 through 4, it was the teachers and mentors themselves who used the levels and provided us with comments for revisions. For example, if you compare the syllabi from our first year report (Nover & Andrews, 1998) with those in our third year report (Nover & Andrews, 2000), you will see that the syllabi, readings, and reflective log questions were modified. This shows our curriculum is not "set in concrete," but rather has gone through numerous revisions as teachers used it in classrooms with deaf students. During the training we used "critical pedagogy" techniques in which teachers read book chapters and journal articles, wrote reflective logs, and, in weekly seminars, discussed how what they learned is and can be applied to deaf students. Thus, the mentors actively involved teachers in constructing knowledge from many sources as they met weekly for two years. In the fourth year of the project, teachers experimented with various assessment instruments (French, 1999a, 1999b) using ASL and English. After applying these bilingual assessments, teachers wrote case studies of specific students.

Overview

Levels 3 and 4 of the ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Model were implemented in five schools. In this report, we focus primarily on how the participating teachers from the five schools learned about ASL/English bilingual assessment of deaf students—a challenging area for the field of deaf education. We include our teachers' backgrounds and their experiences as they read, reflected, and wrote about theories and methods of bilingual assessment. The teachers' reflections of their experiences provide valuable insights into how ASL/English bilingual methodology, techniques, and assessment can be implemented in deaf education classrooms. We also document the teachers' use of technology during Levels 3 and 4 in the project's fourth year. Finally, in this report we

discuss our plans to refine and revise our overall ASL/English Bilingual Professional Staff Development Model in Year 5.

Assessment of Deaf Bilinguals

Assessment for all students is an area that is receiving increased national attention from the Department of Education and the present administration in the White House. Accountability of schools for student achievement has been the focus of numerous newspaper articles and journal reports. Deaf bilingual students should be assessed for the same content knowledge and skills as other students. However, this testing must be unbiased, equitable, and include deaf students' two languages—ASL and English. Even though instruments for assessing ASL have not been available for teachers, this does not exempt schools of their obligation to attempt to assess deaf bilinguals' achievement for instructional purposes. Assessment provides schools, parents, and taxpayers with an accountability mechanism. It allows teachers, principals, and superintendents to support their school curriculum in active informed ways (Cummins, 2000).

Program accountability is just one outcome of assessment. Other functions of assessment include determining placement of students, monitoring students' progress, and diagnosing students' needs. In instructional assessment of deaf bilingual children, each school should select and use linguistically appropriate measures to provide information and guidance to teachers, parents, and school administrators so that deaf bilingual students are held to standards comparable to hearing students. These assessments should provide information that can help teachers' instructional planning and also reveal what the deaf bilingual students are able to do both linguistically and academically. It is important to note

that there is frequently a mismatch between what deaf bilinguals can do in their dominant ASL language compared to what they can do in English, yet we have no tests currently available that can show this discrepancy. During Year 4 of the project, teachers involved in the Star Schools staff development experimented with ASL and English assessments for classroom use with deaf bilingual students and reported their experiences.

ASL Assessment

Currently, teachers do not have a valid, reliable, standardized, and practical assessment of ASL for deaf students. French (1999b) and others have provided some checklists that can be useful; however, these checklists do not have psychometric properties. These checklists are also subjective and highly variable depending on the ASL observation skills of teachers. There are no ASL assessment instruments that are easily administered and teachers can use to gather diagnostic information and develop lesson plans based on students' needs. The few ASL instruments that have been developed rely on a trained ASL linguist or specialist to administer, score, and interpret. Most ASL tests have been checklists without psychometric properties or assessments designed for research purposes, which assess a limited number of syntactic structures and classifiers (Padden & Ramsey, 1998; Prinz & Strong, 1998; Singleton, Suppalla, Litchfield, & Schley, 1998). These tests often require hours of videotaping and analyses by trained ASL linguists or specialists. Even after a score is determined, there exists no developmental ASL curriculum based on linguistic principles that the teacher can use to facilitate ASL acquisition.

Another issue concerning assessment of students' ASL competency relates to teachers' ASL proficiency. Many teachers are not proficient in ASL because many

university teacher-training programs do not provide rigorous ASL coursework. Some teachers may learn ASL on the job from their deaf students and deaf colleagues. This is not a desirable situation because deaf bilingual children need as many adult models of ASL proficiency as the school can provide in order to acquire and develop ASL skills. Teachers who do not know ASL would also have difficulty assessing the ASL skills of their deaf bilingual students. This situation necessitates that schools provide training for teachers who need to improve their ASL proficiency.

Dissatisfaction with Current Assessment Methods

Traditional methods of English assessment for deaf students include standardized tests such as the Stanford Achievement Test-9th edition. This test sometimes can provide useful information for the appropriate placement of deaf students. However, the Stanford 9 was designed for a specific and limited purpose. It is not an all-encompassing tool that teachers can use to make instructional decisions. Rather, it is largely a context-reduced measure of multiple-choice items which the deaf student has limited time to complete. As a result of dissatisfaction with the Stanford 9 and other similar, limited assessments, educators have been searching for alternative assessments that are more useful to teachers and beneficial for students. Recently, the use of informal measures including portfolios or samples of students' work, literacy checklists, communication observation scales, and teacher and parent surveys have been included in the language assessment of deaf students (French, 1999a & b; Schirmer, 2000).

In the assessment of deaf bilinguals, it is important to note that all deaf bilingual students have special strengths and needs. When taking into account the background

characteristics of deaf bilingual students, we must better understand the reasons behind those strengths and needs. A tremendous disservice is done to deaf students when we compare them to dissimilar group of students. Deaf bilinguals' prior language background and educational experiences are likely to influence their linguistic and academic progress, and to ignore these factors is to deny the strengths and needs of deaf bilingual students. Teachers need to know as much about the individual charateristics of the students as possible so students can be provided with the best educational experience.

When we talk about "language proficiency," we also include a description of the characteristics of the individual because many of the background characteristics associated with hearing loss affect language learning. By neglecting to take into account the background variables of deaf children, the researcher is at risk of making inaccurate conclusions if comparing dissimilar populations (Quigley & Kretchmer, 1986). Take the case of the State of North Carolina in a recent publication of achievement scores of deaf students.

The NC state auditor compared the achievement scores of deaf students in the state schools with scores of the deaf students in mainstream programs and published this document: *The Performance Audit for the Department of Health and Human Services for the Division for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (Including the Schools for the Deaf and the Regional Resource Centers)* (Campbell, 2000).[2] The NC state auditor gathered "end of year

[2] This report consisted of an executive summary, operational findings, recommendations, and program overview. The objectives of the NC audit were to compare North Carolina's standard course of study and teaching methods for hearing impaired students to those of other states, examine admission criteria and graduation requirements, compare students at the Schools for the Deaf with deaf and hard of hearing students in the public schools, ascertain whether the work/school environment met applicable health and safety standards for the staff and the students, examine organizational structure and staffing levels, and review operations for adequacy of controls and compliance with applicable laws and regulations (Campbell, 2000).

grade" achievement test data on NC deaf children in two placements: residential schools and mainstream programs. The NC state auditor concluded that deaf children in mainstream programs had higher scores than deaf children enrolled at NC schools for the deaf. In this report, the state auditor did not take into account the demographic characteristics of the deaf population at the residential schools that influenced students' language learning. The following variables have a broad range of effects on the language learning and learning potentials of deaf children: degree and type of hearing loss, age of onset, etiology, ethnicity and home language, parental hearing status, socioeconomic status, IQ, early intervention, and number of years in placement (Quigley & Kretchmer, 1986; Vernon & Andrews, 1990).

The NC state auditor (Campbell, 2000) failed to account for the many variables that influence deaf students' acquisition of language. He did not report the type and extent of hearing loss, age of onset, presence of educational disabilities, number of years spent in the residential school, or home language of the family. In mainstream settings, we often find a large number of deaf students with more usable hearing, which can contribute to higher achievement test scores. Deaf children in mainstream settings are more likely to be postlingually deaf and thus already have a good foundation for language. In addition, students in mainstream programs tend to be from higher socioeconomic statuses, thus having more family income and support services, while more students in the residential schools may be from lower socioeconomic groups. In addition, residential schools are more likely to be the placement for students with educationally significant disabilities.

All of these factors can create bias in a study such as the NC auditor conducted (Campbell, 2000). In a telephone survey to school administrators, we determined that 35% of elementary grade students who were currently enrolled in a NC residential school had

transferred from mainstreamed programs. Yet these low-performing deaf students showed up as low-achievers enrolled in residential schools, while in fact, they were products of mainstream programs. For whatever reasons (e.g., poor programming, additional disabilities, and/or lack of family support), these transfer students came to the residential school later in their school years and their low achievement scores negatively affected the score of the total residential school population. The NC auditor did not account for this variable, contributing further bias to his findings.

In general, mainstream programs tend to attract deaf students who have more hearing, onsets of hearing loss at older ages, fewer educationally significant disabilities, and families with higher incomes. Students who have language delays caused by ineffective oral/aural preschools, severe-to-profound hearing losses with earlier onsets, additional educational disabilities, non-English-speaking homes, and poorer families are more likely to be placed in residential schools. Residential schools often provide services for non-academic, non-diploma, vocationally-tracked youths who, for a number complex reasons, do not score well on English-based tests, but for whom society nevertheless has a social and moral obligation to provide services (Andrews & Nover, 2000). It is important to ensure that background characteristics of deaf bilingual students are taken into account in order to assess them in a fair and equitable manner.

Challenges of Assessing Language

Teachers' assessment of language use in the classroom is complex. For instance, language use in instructional domains (i.e., academic language) differs dramatically from language use during face-to-face communication (i.e., social language). Language use in

academic contexts tends to be more decontextualized and abstract than language use during social interaction. Writing an essay for a science class makes different cognitive and linguistic demands on the deaf bilingual student than having a casual, social conversation over a TTY. Similarly, signing a summary of a complex science lesson in ASL is —cognitively and linguistically more demanding than signing about meeting for a social event. Both languages—ASL and English—have social and academic uses that place different language processing demands on the deaf bilingual student.

We agree that deaf students need strong English competency, yet testing for deaf bilingual children has been traditionally unfair, incomplete, and counterproductive for those students who know more than they may be able to articulate in spoken or written English. Standardized tests such as the Stanford 9 essentially test the deaf bilingual child's knowledge of English. By including deaf students in statewide standardized assessments, superintendents are often faced with the predicament of having to quantify the cognitive, linguistic, and social skills of deaf students whose primary language is ASL. This process raises questions such as What exactly is being assessed when deaf students' skills in language, social studies, science, and math are tested? Is knowledge of subject content or English language ability being assessed? How does deaf students' language proficiency in ASL and English relate to their academic achievement? Should separate standards be developed to consider deaf students' English and ASL development? If so, what would they look like? These are just some of the questions being raised in deaf education today.

As mentioned above, there have been attempts to develop ASL assessments for children; however, these tests have been focused largely on checklists or a restricted set of ASL syntactic structures or classifiers. These tests also consume too much time to

administer, require specialized ASL linguists or ASL specialists to administer and score, and cannot be given by the classroom teacher. There is a need in the field to develop a teacher-friendly ASL assessment for deaf students that is valid, reliable, standardized, and practical. Such an assessment should be easy to administer, score, and analyze by each student's teacher so that it can become a tool to guide instruction. A measure such as this does not currently exist.

Today, assessment theorists see classroom assessment as a tool that can be used to guide instruction that supports students' learning and teachers' effectiveness (Shepherd, 2000a, 2000b). Traditionally, language testing has been focused on context-reduced measures rather than testing language use in authentic situations (Cummins, 2000). Today, assessment theorists call for an improvement in test content and forms of assessment that will more clearly mirror what needs to be taught in the classroom. Assessment theorists, as well as many educators, see a need to protect classroom assessment from the negative effects of accountability testing mandated in many states today. Many are recommending that classroom assessment involve multiple measures, not a single test. Assessment should be viewed as dynamic and ongoing, and it should occur also in the middle of teaching rather than held until the end. Assessment should involve building upon prior knowledge and providing students with feedback (Shepherd, 2000a, 2000b).

Assessment as an interactive process that provides authentic and meaningful feedback for students' learning and guidelines for teachers' instructional practice has been elaborated and recommended by Shepherd (2000a, 2000b) and Stefanakis (1998). Attempts have been made to address the assessment of ASL and English language abilities of deaf bilingual children (French, 1999a). Some of the questions our Year 4 report attempts to

answer are How do teachers of deaf bilingual children provide authentic and meaningful feedback to their students? How do teachers take into account deaf bilingual students' family histories and experiences? What is the impact of setting (home, school) on the child's language development? What tools and strategies do teachers use to assess students?

Sociocultural Approach to Assessment

In this report, we view assessment of the ASL/English bilingual child using a sociocultural approach. We describe the complexity of assessing the deaf child's first and second languages. We look at the interaction between the teacher and the deaf bilingual learner to understand the political, social, cultural, and linguistic factors involved. We understand that assessing the deaf bilingual child should be multifaceted and involve multiple perspectives and multiple methods. The role of the teacher is very important because the teacher is with the deaf bilingual child every day of school. A sociocultural perspective also assumes that students learn language in real-life situations that heavily involve social interaction with adults and peers—both deaf and hearing. We also understand that deaf bilinguals may require more time to take tests and use different reasoning strategies in answering assessment questions.

During Year 4 of the project, Star Schools teachers studied and reviewed various models and techniques of bilingual assessment (Cummins, 2000; Dixon-Krauss, 1996; Fradd & McGee, 1994; Stefanakis, 1998), as well as assessment tools and strategies developed for deaf bilingual students (French, 1999; Livingston, 1997). Teachers used the assessment tools with their students to discover the effectiveness of the instruments. The teachers became observers and recorders of students' learning activities using multiple

formats (e.g., literacy checklists, communication scales, parent and student surveys). In addition, teachers and mentors discussed ways they could use the assessment results to help plan and facilitate more effective instruction.

Methodology

The following broad research questions guided our Year 4 report: (1) How do Star Schools teachers use ASL to facilitate English language development? (2) How do teachers informally assess the ASL and English skills of deaf bilingual students and how effective are these assessment strategies? (3) How can teachers improve assessment in their class and at their school? And, (4) How do teachers use assessment results to plan instruction that builds on students' strengths and addresses students' needs?

We selected excerpts from teachers' reflective logs as they described their classroom assessment practices and what they learned about their students as a result of using the assessments from the Star Schools training. These excerpts from teachers' reflections present the process of classroom assessment and the context in which the process occurs: the daily life of the deaf education classroom.

Backgrounds of the Teachers

Teachers from five residential schools for deaf students were involved in Year 4 of this study. New Mexico School for the Deaf (NMSD), Texas School for the Deaf (TSD), Kansas School for the Deaf (KSD), Illinois School for the Deaf (ISD), and Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf (ENCSD) participated. Thirty-two teachers and 13 mentors participated in Year 4 of the project. Most teachers and mentors were female and Caucasian. Teachers worked in classrooms with deaf students ranging from parent-infant programs to high school, with the majority of the students in the elementary grades (see

Table 2). More than half of the teachers were younger than 40 years of age. More than two-thirds had master's degrees, primarily in deaf education. Other majors included reading, elementary education, psychology, special education, and second language acquisition. About half of the teachers had taught fewer than five years, and one-fourth had more than 20 years of teaching experience. The majority of teachers had state teaching certification, and about one-fourth had Council on Education of the Deaf (CED) certification.

Data Collection

The written reflections of the participating teachers (n = 32) made up the database. We collected teachers' reflective logs for one full year. Excerpts that reflected both thinking about and application of bilingual methods and assessment techniques were selected. Also noted were innovative ways that teachers used technology to teach the two languages—ASL and English. Some of the excerpts from the teachers' reflective logs can be used as models for other bilingual teachers working with deaf students.

Background of Teachers and Mentors

Table 2: Background Variables of the Mentors and Teachers Participating in Year 4 of the Star Schools Training (2000-2001) (n = 45)

Teachers' and Mentors' Background Variables	**N**	**%**
School		
NMSD	9	18
TSD	11	24
KSD	8	18
ENCSD	9	20
ISD	8	18
Gender		
Female	42	93
Male	3	7
Grade Level Taught[3]		
0-3/preschool/Kindergarten	8	18
1-3rd grade	8	18

[3] Some teachers taught more than one grade level.

4-5th grade	10	22
6th, 7th, 8th grade	8	18
High school	2	4
Other[4]	5	11
Hearing Status		
Deaf	19	42
Hearing	26	58
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	2	4
White	43	96
Age		
20-30	15	35
31-40	10	23
41-50	13	30
51-60	5	12
College Degree		
BA	14	31
MA	31	69
Ph.D.	1	
# Yrs Teaching Experience		
0-5	20	50
6-10	4	10
11-20	6	15
21-30	10	25
Certification		
State	38	84
National (CED)	11	24

The Context

As mentioned previously and in prior reports, the Star Schools inservice lasts for two years. In the first year, teachers participated in 24 seminars (two hours each) totaling 48 hours of seminar training, focusing on bilingual theories and techniques. In the second year, teachers again participated in 24 seminars (two hours each) totaling 48 hours of seminar training, focusing on teaching language and literacy based on bilingual assessment and bilingual methodology. Typically, the teachers met in weekly seminars led by at least two mentors. Teachers completed reading assignments and then wrote reflective logs in response to questions designed by Project staff and mentors. Mentors developed lesson

[4] Other included curriculum director, evaluation specialist, administrator, and elementary dorm parent.

plans, PowerPoint presentations, and activities for seminars that best fit the needs of the teachers and students at their school.

In the Fall of 2000 and Spring of 2001, in Levels 3 and 4 of the training, teachers explored ways of assessing students' language and literacy behaviors by applying various tools for assessing ASL and English (see Appendices C and D for Levels 3 and 4—syllabi, readings, and reflective log questions). Based on the results of these assessments, teachers identified bilingual methodology to match the language (ASL and English) and English literacy needs of deaf students.

In the next two sections, we provide excerpts from reflective logs of Star School teachers sharing their experiences about how they used bilingual strategies and bilingual assessment techniques with deaf students. In this report, we focus only on Levels 3 and 4 of the inservice at the five site schools: New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, Illinois, and Eastern North Carolina Schools for the Deaf.

Teacher Reflections

Level 3: Bilingual Assessment and Methodologies I

In the first session, teachers read chapters in *Whose Judgment Counts: Assessing Bilingual Students, K-3* (Stefanakis, 1998) and Dixon-Krauss' (1996) *Vygotsky in the Classroom: Mediated Literacy Instruction and Assessment*. In these books, the authors emphasized the importance of a sociocultural view of language assessment in which the student is perceived as learning language in real-life situations and language learning is dependent upon social interaction. The authors also discussed how assessment is multifaceted and involves multiple perspectives, including the teachers' own views on

student learning. They also debated the advantages and disadvantages of standardized tests and informal tests. The authors viewed informal tests as providing more authentic information for the teacher to utilize in designing effective language lessons for the students. As Nile Stanley in Dixon-Krauss' book emphasized, "Diagnosis should be the blueprint for instruction, not an end in itself" (p. 141).

Here are some teachers' comments when asked to write about what informal language assessments they used in the classroom.

Reflective Log Question 3.1a: Describe how you have conducted informal language assessments, and reflect on the usefulness of these assessments in your instruction.

> I will use informal and formal discussions with students to assess their ASL skills. I facilitate meetings at the beginning of every class. This is a good time for me to see how the students follow the conversations as well as their command of culturally appropriate mannerisms (e.g., when to ask a questions, how to get another person's attention, how to use eye contact as a form of communication). I also use dialogue journals with students to assess their informal English. We will have dialogue back and forth about issues common to the students. I use this to see how they think. Often when students write a formal paper, they check and re-check their paper several times. With the dialogue journals I am able to see their exact thought process without revision. I also use the AOL Instant Message for this same reason.

Another teacher had a number of informal assessment tools for both ASL and English. Here is what she reported.

> Briefly, a few other informal language assessment tools that I felt were helpful were: 1) Story sequencing - Sequence in order, pictures and sentences taken from a book read by the class. 2) Cooperative reading - Have students take turns reading aloud (signing aloud) from an assigned book. 3) Language Experience Story - This is ideal for students with very little language. I took a student on a bike ride along the Potomac River and then we wrote about the experience. 4) Cloze - Students fill in the blank with the correct words from a word bank. 5) Story mapping - This is helpful to see how well they are able to follow a chain of events. 6) Read Aloud (sign aloud) - How well are the students able to make predictions? 7) Role-Play in ASL where we act out the characters in the story.

This early reflective log question raised teachers' awareness of the need to observe and document language behaviors in both the languages—ASL and English. However, our review of the teachers' responses to this reflective log question revealed that, although teachers were able to describe classroom assessment procedures, they did not report using any rubrics or rating scales on levels of development. Not until the teachers read French's (1999b) *The Toolkit* in later sessions did they start mentioning utilization of those kinds of assessment tools.

Reflective Log Question 3.1b: Using Dixon-Krauss' (1996) Chapter 8 as a guide, what are some issues to consider or questions you might ask yourself when assessing culturally diverse students?

Teachers reported that they surveyed their students and families about their cultural background, noted by Dixon-Krauss (1996) as an important variable in language assessment. Teachers also asked students if their families used sign language at home.

> I will question first what culture s/he came from and what language is used at home. I will need to know if the deaf child is strongly involved with family culture and the quality of communication at home. I need to find out if the parents know sign language, are learning sign language, or do not know any signs. It does make a difference since most hearing parents who know sign language tend to share family culture with their deaf children. How much does this deaf student value his/her family culture? Does this student hear well enough to be able to converse without sign language?

Another teacher asked about the amount of ASL and English language used at home. Here are her comments.

> I will also question whether the primary language is being used 100% of time? 50% of time? I will also question if they speak only, or also read or listen in that language as well. It does make a difference to know if my deaf student is being exposed fully or a little to his/her family language in spoken or/and written language.

Another teacher asked about the family values of education, how deaf students felt about their deafness, and about the socioeconomic status of the family. Here are that teacher's comments.

> I will question if the parents value education because it will help me understand where parents stand when it comes to education. Support from parents toward deaf student's education is what I think is important for me to know. I will also check to see if the student is proud of their deafness. What kind of education did this student received in the past? Some have great experiences in mainstreaming programs/residential schools. Some do not have positive experiences. What socioeconomic status of the family is the student from? What are the family's experiences of being discriminated against in the past?

Reflective Log Question: 3.2: Create a teacher self-portrait that includes a brief description of your teaching background, your philosophy of teaching and learning, and your instructional strategies. Prepare a diagram of your classroom or learning environment, and explain how the arrangement facilitates learning for your students.

In this next session, teachers read chapters in Stefanakis' (1998) book on how bilingual teachers perform classroom assessments and how teachers design portraits of bilingual students they assess. A sociocultural perspective, described in Stefanakis' chapters, hightlights the importance of social interaction in language development. From this viewpoint, it is important that assessment methods take into account the interactions between teachers and students and among the students themselves. Bilingual students can exhibit different knowledge and use of language depending upon the social context. Therefore, many educators and educational researchers advocate assessing bilingual children using multiple formats and multiple people's perspectives.

Here, a teacher reflects on her philosophy of teaching and learning, as well as some of her instructional strategies.

> What is important to me in teaching is that students learn and use critical thinking, problem solving, and affective social/interpersonal skills. I use

> content in Science, Math, Social Studies, Writing, and Current Events to foster the development of critical thinking and problem solving skills. Using both languages, ASL and English, I do quite a bit of questioning, requiring the students to justify and explain their responses. Hands on, cooperative learning helps develop interpersonal/social skills. Subject area content is a means to an end, not an end in itself.

Stefanakis (1998) also discussed the importance of teachers' planning prior to assessment and creating a language learning environment. In her book, teachers described how they organized the physical environment of the classroom to facilitate student interactions.

Here, two Star Schools teachers described how they addressed classroom design.

> In addition to centers and toys/materials available, we pay attention to lighting, glare, and ability to see across the room. We have a variety of pictures, print, books, and pictures of signs visible for the students. Not only does the physical environment facilitate learning, our daily routine or schedule facilitates learning.
>
> My classroom has several areas, desks, a horseshoe table, a round table, and a reading area. The desks are arranged in a U shape, allowing all students to see each other and me. The horseshoe and round table are used for small group instruction by my aide or myself. I am very conscious of the students being able to see each other when we have discussions, and try to arrange the room accordingly.

Reflective Question Log 3.3a: Observe and describe the use of ASL and English among staff and students at your school. Discuss your issues or concerns regarding language use for effective communication and how this impacts student learning.

In the third session, teachers read the first chapter of Sue Livingston's book, *Rethinking the Education of Deaf Students: Theory and Practice from a Teacher's Perspective* (1997). Livingston's first chapter, entitled "What Has Gone Wrong in the Education of Deaf Students and Why," describes the psycholinguistic reasons that English-based sign systems are not the panacea for deaf education, because they do not fit the "meaning-making and meaning-sharing needs of a visual/gestural modality" (p. 6). As she

states, "it is time to stop feeding Deaf students pablum and instead to provide them with a real language…," ASL (p. 8). In addition, she explains why a transitional model of bilingual education (where instruction in English is gradually phrased in and increased until it becomes the exclusive language of instruction) is not viable for deaf students. Livingston advocates for the use of whole, meaning-based, and contextualized learning for deaf students, as well as bilingual instruction that takes advantage of the reciprocal relationships between language, reading, and writing.

Teachers expressed their concerns related to the use of ASL and English at their schools and how this language use impacts student learning.

> Of all my observations for the use of ASL and English amongst staff and students the *use* of ASL or English does not concern me as much as how well *meaning* is delivered. Take for instance when an adult announced to a group of students prior to departing on a field trip that they have a certain responsibility for the reputation of the school. When reputation was signed, it was not clear - especially to young students. It was necessary to clarify this knowing that the students failed to get the message. In another instance, another adult signed, "work" as in "to work" (verb) instead of signing, "work" as in, "to succeed" or "achieve" (adjective?). I have observed this kind of communication from both English and ASL users. I am also guilty of this as well because I have caught myself using signs that did not reflect the concept/message of what I was communicating.
>
> Distorting the message that we give to students seriously impairs their learning. In fact, because the meaning of the message that we communicate to the student is so often confused, I have found that students do not ask for clarification because they have come to accept all messages, even when they don't make sense. This may be because they really don't know the difference (a clear message versus a message without meaning). Is it any wonder then that the language development of deaf children progresses so slowly?
>
> The use of ASL amongst the staff and students at my school is extremely minimal. First, the majority of the teachers in our elementary department are hearing. Second, the training that most of these teachers received focused on the use of Signed English in the education of deaf students. Therefore, the academic instruction for the students at my school involves very limited, if any, ASL. The teachers in my school's elementary [program] mainly use a

> form of CASE throughout each school day. I understand that when most of our educators were trained, total communication was the method of choice, so it makes sense that they have been using this method in their classrooms. However, I am often appalled at the negative attitudes our educators have toward a bilingual/bicultural education for our deaf students, not to mention their complete unwillingness to even learn about this method. The field of education in general is constantly changing, and for one to remain an effective teacher, he/she must also remain open-minded and flexible! The lack of effort to use ASL at our school has a tremendous impact on our students. Our students are not able to acquire their first language naturally. Instead, they are being forced to learn an artificial form of English. This is especially detrimental for our students who must rely on school for any of their language development because sign language is not used in their homes. Without language, it is impossible for our students to learn higher-level concepts. In addition, without an ASL language base, our students are highly unlikely to become competent English users. Their reading and writing skills will likely always be below average. The irony is that Signed English was created specifically to promote a deaf child's English skills, and the educators who use it believe that ASL will be harmful to a deaf student's English development. Even after years of seeing Signed English fail miserably with most deaf children, many educators are still unable to accept the necessity of ASL in our students' lives and education.

In response to a second question, teachers wrote about Vygotsky's theory of language learning. Teachers read about Vygotsky's sociohistorical perspective on how children learn language in Dixon-Krauss (1996). They learned about constructivist learning, emergent literacy, and whole language and discussed how those apply to deaf children's learning of ASL and English.

Reflective Log Question 3.3b: Vygotsky (as cited in Dixon-Krause, 1996) described intellectual development as moving from social communication to internal thought. In what ways might this theory apply to deaf students whose access to communication with family members is limited?

One teacher linked Vygotsky's theory (as cited in Dixon-Krause, 1996) to deaf children's learning of visual language.

> The application of Vygotsky's psychological principle of internal thought to situations where there is limited access to communication seems obvious. If there is less social communication happening, less will become egocentric

> speech and less will become inner speech. The implication is for good early intervention with an emphasis on developing social communication. Inner thought and concept development may be delayed, but I think with early intervention, families and students can learn to communicate visually.

Reflective Log Question 3.4a: Fradd and McGee (1996) (Chapter 4) stress the importance of using assessment to determine the language needs of bilingual students. How have your views changed toward students who have been labeled as having "language disorders" when considering their limited language opportunities?

In this session, teachers read a chapter from Fradd and McGee's (1994) book, *Instructional Assessment: An Integrative Approach to Evaluating Student Performance* on differentiating language disorders from the effects of limited opportunities for language learning. According to these authors, many students who enter school with a limited first language have a difficult time learning a second language. Teachers have a dearth of information on how to work with these students.

Here are some teacher comments about students with limited opportunities for learning language.

> My views changed when I find out details about a student's cultural & linguistic background, family values, student's deafness, communication and behavior at home and school along with educational background. I also have to look at the teachers and staff at the school whether they are fluent in a primary language of the student and whether the school is willing to get better services for the student and his family. It often helps me consider if a specific student has limited language learning opportunities rather than being labeled as having "language disorders."

> I have always been in agreement with the importance of using assessment to determine the language needs of bilingual students. First and foremost, it is of utmost importance that the schools have up to date testing materials that give valid information for the students being tested and that testers use the right kinds of tests and then are capable of interpreting those test results and providing intervention that maximize educational gains. The tests should also aid the examiner in determining if the student being tested is language delayed due to language disorder or limited language learning opportunities. After reading chapter 4, I feel that it is imperative that the adults in the school system are knowledgeable and willing to take the interest in students' language learning. I had been aware of limited language opportunities, but

hadn't realized that it would have such an impact on the language of the child. As I was reading, I was mentally evaluating my students and wondering which ones might fit into the categories of language disorders or limited language opportunity.

Reflective Log Question 3.4b. Give examples of arrested educational development, limited opportunities for language development, or communication disorders in your school. What are your suggestions to meet these students' needs?

An example of a student with "arrested educational development" would be a young child who has been exposed to sign language for a short period of time, receives an implant and is placed in an oral/aural learning environment and then returns to a signing environment. Some children who are D/HH from families who are hearing still fall into the "limited opportunities for language development" category. I can think of one or two children I taught in the past, who fall into the "communication disorders" category. It's interesting to me, now, that these children had difficulty with both ASL and English skills. Suggestions to meet these students' needs include a good understanding of their educational and family background, using a variety of assessment tools, looking at functional communication skills, and making sure to include assessment of semantic, syntax, and pragmatic skills. In addition, I would accept the child at their level of communication and expect acquisition. Exposure to ASL and English would be another important element to meet their needs. The education would need to be child-centered and functional.

Most of my students are "limited opportunities for language development" learners. We have many parents who lack minimal signing skills. When pre-school programs are provided for the children, they do not attend on a regular basis. Communication with adults, mainly takes place in the classroom. Dormitory staffers often do not have the ability to communicate at a level that the children understand.

Because the parental involvement in our school is very low, with the exception of a few parents, we cannot depend on the home for much support.

Since the school does have control over the dormitory situation, I would like to see the elementary dorms staffed by supervisors who are fluent in the use of ASL. I would like to see more music, poetry and drama taking place in the dorm.

I would like to see skills taught that would require students to be creative and use critical thinking skills. I have noticed that children in a routine situation tend to give routine answers to questions. When the routine is changed, these same students cannot give the correct response to the same questions. They are often not given time to think things through and come up with answers on their own.

I would immerse children in a language rich environment, requiring that they ask for things using signs and not just pointing. I would have someone read to them, as a group, on a daily basis using ASL.

I would provide a lot of hands-on, experience related lessons in groups so the children can talk about what it is that they have done and can relate to the lesson.

I would provide opportunities for the students to communicate with each other during lessons so they have the opportunity to use their new vocabulary and/or experiences.

I would encourage them to build a reading and fingerspelled vocabulary and set up opportunities for them to share their skills with each other.

If the children are mature enough, I would encourage them to help each other with difficult areas.

I would set up a situation where a student from another classroom would come into my classroom and read to my students, serving as a role model for both language and reading.

I would encourage students to read to their parents at home. I would hope that this would foster some quality time with the student and the parent(s), as well as help the parents develop pride in their child and his/her abilities. Hopefully, these parents will also be learning new signs from their children.

I am looking at this from a kindergarten perspective. These examples would fit the needs of the communication disorder students as well as the limited opportunities students at this level.

Reflective Log Question 3.5a: In what ways do you think deaf students are mislabeled as having inherent cognitive, academic, and behavioral deficits based on their academic performance? What suggestions do you have to change this situation?

In the fifth session, teachers read Fradd and McGee's (1994) chapter on identifying the special needs of students. Bilingual children can have special learning needs such as a reading or math learning disability, and an attempt to identify these special needs should be undertaken. However, Fradd and McGee pointed out that many students learning English as a second language may be misclassified as having a learning disability due to their difficulty with English, rather than their possessing an authentic cognitive, academic, or behavioral deficit.

Some teachers noted that many deaf children's apparent behavior problems are probably due to frustration, resulting from an early lack of full access to language and a continued paucity of quality communication with parents at home. Here are what some teachers wrote as they applied Fradd and McGee's (1994) ideas to their teaching and assessment of deaf students.

> I feel that some students are mislabeled as having behavioral deficits due to lack of communication. Some of the students who are in our preschool and transitional kindergarten (and even higher grades) "act out" or "blow up" because they cannot communicate what they need/want. Sometimes, parents/caregivers cannot communicate with their deaf child, which can also cause behavior problems. The child acts out because he/she tends to only be physically disciplined (spanked or otherwise) instead of the parent/caregiver explaining what they did not like about the child's behavior.
>
> We see many behavior issues due to frustration. The state forces us to teach our students at an age appropriate level, which is often overwhelming for students. A child who has limited communication skills may know only one way to express his frustration. Another problem is that many of our students are treated differently at home. Inappropriate behavior sometimes results from a lack of discipline at home. The point is that behavior often interferes with academic progress. The student may have academic problems due to behavior problems caused by frustration or lack of discipline.
>
> I think that the biggest reason that deaf students are mislabeled as having cognitive and/or academic deficits is because of standardized tests. Our students are given the same tests as hearing students who are in the same grade. The problem is that these tests do not give an accurate picture of what our deaf students DO know. It's so frustrating that people in higher positions do not realize this. They expect our students to perform the same as their hearing peers. But our students are not hearing, they are deaf. Our students need a little more time to develop language, in order to approach these types of tests and be successful.

Reflective Log Question 3.5b: Consider the needs of a student whose language development (English or ASL) is delayed in comparison to other students in your class. How do you change your instruction or classroom procedures to meet the language needs of that student?

In this next question, a teacher discussed what strategies she used to meet the language needs of her language-delayed deaf students.

> At the beginning of this school year, I had two students whose language development seemed very delayed. To meet their language needs, I tried to make everything more visual than normal. I use many pictures and manipulative. I will have a faster student work with a slower student or will try to pair students who can help each other. All of my kindergarten students have delayed language development (some students more than others). Since it is a "handicapping" condition in my classroom, I try to have as many hands-on, experience related, group activities as possible. I find that this helps both those who are behind and those who are more advanced.

Reflective Log Question 3.6a: List three activities/strategies you can use to capitalize on the use of ASL to facilitate students' English literacy development.

In this session, the teachers read chapters in French's (1999a*), Starting with Assessment: A Developmental Approach to Deaf Children's Literacy*, on principles of literacy assessment. They discussed how traditional assessment procedures have failed to capture the learning strengths of deaf students. They also studied how to look at deaf students' language and literacy progress developmentally over a long period of time. Deaf students go through predictable stages in learning to read and write. Also, the teachers read about how conversational language or communication competence lays the foundation for literacy development. Characteristics of successful language and literacy programs were given (French, 1999a).

Here are some teachers' comments on how they already used or could start to use ASL to facilitate their deaf students' English language development.

> The first activity I can think of would be a series of steps involving storytelling: first, I have my student tell me a (made-up) story via ASL. While the student is telling me the story, I will type what has been said. We will work together on creating a book (illustrations, etc.), and when it is done, the student will once again tell the story using the book that we created together. This will help facilitate the student's English literacy in several ways: 1) develop a story sense, 2) notice the English translations of the story (e.g., vocabulary terms), and 3) create a better understanding of the process of ASL-English transitions. Another activity would be having the student invent an "ABC" story (using the signs themselves to create a story), and when done, writing down the story (following the story concept rather than the A-B-C part). The third activity includes conversational ASL. I have two students

converse in ASL on an assigned subject, while the other students write down what is being said. Actually, the purpose of this activity is to familiarize the students with writing dialogue--but it makes things more interesting for the students to see others converse in ASL and have to write down an English translation of the conversation.

My strategy is to provide ASL exposure first to build prior knowledge and then create activities related to unit study to build schemas. I list words on the blackboard for key concepts. I have students explain concepts in ASL given the word. We read high interest books and discuss each chapter in ASL. We identify main, ideas, use subheadings, supporting details, make predictions, and determine opinions, etc. We do mini-lessons on writing after discussing their own webbing, and build skills (when they see fit) in ASL. We share with the whole class so they can benefit from it. (Kids use ASL to identify what they want to write. I create a webmap in English using their words).

One way to capitalize on the use of ASL and to facilitate English development of our students is to use fingerspelling. I believe this is a terrific way to develop vocabulary awareness in our students. Certainly, we cannot fingerspell all the time. Incorporating fingerspelling when introducing new concepts--spelling and then signing the word--is very important. If the students only remember several letters that were fingerspelled, it still helps.

Asking students to sign in ASL what they read in English is an important assessment tool, especially if the student is already skilled in ASL. Many of our students are able to 'read aloud' but they usually do so word-for-word. That is never effective. It does not help us monitor our student's comprehension. Having students 'read-aloud' in ASL helps others understand text being read and monitor each other's comprehension also.

The third strategy that comes to mind is to have students develop stories in ASL. They could videotape themselves signing a story that has been developed purely in ASL (perhaps with notes for reminders). After that, the students should edit their stories (again, through ASL). After their "final" story has been developed, they could sit down and attempt to write what they signed. This would be effective because the hard part, the "thinking-creating" part, has already been done and they can simply concentrate on the English part.

Reflective Log Question 3.6b: Examine the "Stages of Literacy Development Checklist" (French, 1999) with your students in mind. What information do you think this tool could provide you about your students? How would this help guide your instruction?

French (1999a, b) has developed checklists of literacy behaviors with four stages that teachers can use to guide their classroom instruction. French's four levels or stages of literacy are emergent, beginning, developing, and maturing reader and writer. The stages

are characterized by specific skills and have corresponding assessment tools for reading, conversational proficiency, and writing. Teachers reflected on the possible utility of French's checklist in relation to their students and planning instruction.

> This tool will help me determine which stage (Emerging, Beginning, Developing or Maturing) my students are currently in now. It will also help me not to overwhelm my students. It also will help me see my students' strengths and figure out what area they need to be taught so they can have skills that they lack.
>
> This tool also will guide my instruction by determining what to teach individually and in-group. This will help me determine who to pair up if I decide to set up activities that require pairs.

Reflective Log Question 3.7a: List all of the ASL interpretation strategies found in Livingston, Chapter 2. Which strategies have you observed or used in your classroom? Give two examples, and describe how they were used.

In the next session, teachers read Livingston's (1997) chapter on utilizing ASL interpretation strategies to ensure comprehension and provide meaningful learning experiences for deaf students. Teachers discussed interpretation strategies (from ASL to English and from English to ASL) such as making mental images, being explicit, using rhetorical questions, and setting up contrast through negation. Teachers were asked to list and then describe how they used the ASL interpretation strategies outlined by Livingston. Here are some of the teachers' responses.

1. Rhetorical Questions- questions that bring the attention to the main points in a lecture or major events in a story.
2. Stepping Into Character- constructed dialogue between people. The teacher actually shows the conversation.
3. The Repetition with Alternate Signs or Sign Phrases- using synonym signs or phrases to repeat an idea.
4. Referring Back- The use of the signs "remember" or "recent" to bring the listener back to an earlier portion of the text to connect a new idea with a former idea.

5. Creating Contrast Through Negation- The teacher negates what was just said, and then follows with the correct meaning.

6. Visual Sign Choices- gives students further explanation; signs or sign phrases that give meaning in an image creating, gestural or pictorial way. (Example- the insurance card).

7. Summaries- a brief synopsis of preceding information before moving on to the next idea.

8. Explaining Before Labeling- When the teacher waits to label a concept until he/she gives enough information so the students understand the concept first.

9. Contextual Hook Up- the context of the question; replaying the scene just before asking the question. The art of framing comprehensive questions for students.

10. Question Aids- helping students know exactly what the question requires.

With regard to creating mental images, I have seen and used this strategy quite frequently. I have observed students in simple conversation explaining a weekend event or sharing a creative writing story to the class. I use this strategy often during guided reading to make sure students get the "full picture" of a scene in a story. (A student recently was so engrossed for a seemingly long time during a story that I unconsciously stopped and asked her what was wrong. To which she replied that she was "just imagining.") With the strategy of Being Explicit, this too I have observed my students use with one another in cases where one student digs deeper and narrower to make the core of her content clear to her audience. Making what is implied explicit is a crucial component to successful (reading) comprehension. We have daily ASL storyreading time done by a deaf adult. She has been one of the most detailed and explicit interpreters for storyreading I have seen. The students sit in silent awe as they focus on the story unfolding visually; a virtual movie through the air. Stepping into character is something I do quite often during guided reading and then watch with envy when our storyreader makes it so fluid. I've used this also in discussion while emphasizing issues during the current elections. I do use rhetorical questions in all subject areas to hone in on the main idea, key concepts, and vocabulary. (This often engages the student who may not regularly participate in discussions.)

I think that I tend to use "stepping into character" the most, especially when teaching guided reading on the overhead. One of my reading groups has been reading the book, *Miss Nelson is Back!* Of course I modeled the technique of "stepping into character." Then I ask two students to put on the blonde wig for Miss Nelson, and the black wig for Miss Viola Swamp! They took turns reading the dialogue of the two characters. They had great fun and when the lesson was finished, they had an understanding of what the plot was about.

> I also seem to use the strategy of "referring back" when explaining a concept. One time when explaining a concept in a reading lesson, my class was reading the book, "Henry's Awful Mistake." I signed, "Remember when?... Henry destroyed his old house because of chasing the ant. Now he has moved into a new house, what did he see? An ant, yes; so what will he do now that he sees another ant in his new house? You are right; he will just ignore it!" This strategy helped the students understand that the character, Henry, will not make the same mistake twice.

Reflective Log Question 3.7b: Select an interpretation strategy from Livingston (1997), Chapter 2, that you use infrequently. Consider ways to apply that strategy in the classroom, and describe how and in what context you might use it.

Here are examples of two teachers' reflections upon how they could increase their use of Livingston's (1997) ASL interpretation strategies.

> I have not consistently seen or used the strategy of Contextual Hook-Up. I think this would be fairly easy to use while telling a story. I could refer back to pictures related to the question. This strategy could also be used when we "remember" what we did in centers. The sequence or content could be presented before asking a child what they did in centers.
>
> The strategy I use most infrequently would be Creating Contrast Through Negation. I think I could use the strategy more when giving directions. For example, before giving a test, I could use this strategy like this: Teacher: "Are you permitted to chat if you finish early?... No, you need to read your book."

Reflective Log Question 3.8a: Select two students on which to do assessments throughout the year for your Language/Literacy Project. Using Figure 3-4 (Fradd & McGee, 1994, p. 135) as a guide, describe the levels of ASL proficiency of the two students in your project in terms of form, function, and content.

In this session, teachers selected two students with varied levels of abilities and conducted ASL and English assessments using the techniques they learned from reading Fradd and McGee (1994) and French (1999 a, b).

Here are several examples of teachers applying the ideas from their reading to assess their (two) students' language abilities.

The two students I have selected for my Language/Literacy Project are 'KH' and 'MB.' According to Figure 3-4, language development can be divided into three major components: form, function, and content. Form includes grammar and phonology, content includes concepts and semantic variables, while function includes language tasks and communicative tasks. Each component can be divided into a level of proficiency: beginner, primary, intermediate, and advanced. I believe 'MB' is an English-dominant bilingual. At this point in time, I would say that 'MB' is at an intermediate level for form and content, but is moving into the advanced level for function. On the other hand, 'KH' is an ASL-dominant bilingual who appears to be at a primary level for form and content, but an intermediate area for function.

I have chosen two students for this project. The first student, we will call 'K' is really growing in development. I think I see him at the Primary (Level 2) stage in his academic language but socially he is beginning to become intermediate. He is able to answer who, what, and where questions about things he has experienced. His ability to use past, present, and future tense is emerging. His conceptual understanding of his environment is very well developed. He is usually easily understood by people who are not native to ASL or who are not part of his communication circle. He can elaborate about stories, use descriptive terms, and has a fairly wide vocabulary.

The other student I have chosen will be called 'L.' He is also at the Primary (Level 2) level, but is not as advanced. 'L' is aphasic and not Deaf. He uses ASL to communicate as well as English. Both languages are developing but not yet mastered. He can respond to who and what questions on a daily basis, but sometimes struggles with where. He does not always have the vocabulary to label things, although I feel that he knows more about his environment than he can label. His social language seems to be developing. He has difficulty initiating conversations. He struggles with descriptive terms. His language is at the sentence level in both ASL and English.

Student 1, 'D', is at the Primary Level 2 for ASL acquisition, with some competency in the "progression toward next level" checklist. She asks and answers what, where, and who questions, although not always appropriately. She is not always understood by native speakers. She does not consistently mark tense at all, much less with appropriate grammar. She does speak in phrases and sentences of information surrounding a main topic, although not in correct ASL grammar. She over-uses and incorrectly uses prepositions such as "to" and "for," and adds a lot of unnecessary "the's" and "and's."

Student 2, 'R', is at the Intermediate Level 3 for ASL acquisition, with some competency in the "progression toward next level" checklist. He uses a range of responses to communicate, produces action narratives, and asks a range of questions appropriately. He consistently uses tense markers' grammatical structures correctly. He is usually understood by native speakers. He sometimes forgets to add background information before telling a story or asking a question. He will often

neglect to include the subject or "who" so the other person may know what is happening, but not who is involved.

Reflective Log Question 3.8b: Why is the ability to assess students' levels of conversational proficiency accurately important?

Teachers discussed the importance of assessing students' communication proficiency in ASL and some ways to do this more effectively.

> It is vital for me to be able to accurately assess language at a conversational level. If I can do this, it will help me to gauge my students' academic language and what progress I can expect. Students learn more by experiencing and relating to their environment. If we can provide them with an environment to foster this growth first, then the academic language will come. They need to be rich socially in order to progress academically. Also, skills needed to be a lifelong learner mostly revolve around socialization.
>
> For most of our students, ASL is the L1 (i.e., first language). To effectively assess a student's proficiency in ASL, an evaluator must ascertain the student's skills in a variety of situations. Often, in a classroom or clinical setting, students do not have the opportunity to fully demonstrate the level of their proficiency. If, however, the students are free to converse with their peers, their teachers, other students, and other adults, an evaluator might get a better picture of the level of proficiency. Assessing conversational proficiency provides a picture of both receptive and expressive skills.

Reflective Log Question 3.9a: Discuss some of the advantages and disadvantages that must be considered in implementing an assessment program that includes ASL competencies rather than using only standardized tests and placement criteria based on English competencies.

In this session, teachers read French's (1999a) chapter on assessment in the classroom, which elaborated on "authentic assessments" that test performance on "real-world" activities. Teachers read about a broad, comprehensive approach to assessment that included observing both processes and products of literacy. Interviews and retellings were examples of methods that described processes, such as conversational or written language processes, responses, or attitudes. Portolios are an example of methods that describe learning by examining the products of students' efforts.

Teachers examined how to measure literacy using a variety of methods such as anecdotal records, interviews, surveys, checklists, retellings, observations during miscues, performance-based assessments and rubrics, portfolios, and rating scales. These literacy assessments recommended by French (1999b) are designed to motivate students and inform both teachers and students as to what literacy entails. The reading also covered how to use assessments to build a picture of deaf students' long-term development and establish long-term goals. In short, the teachers came to understand the importance of approaching literacy assessment developmentally and establishing goals to help students acquire all the language and literacy skills at the different developmental levels.

Here is one teacher's view related to French's (1999a, b) ideas about authentic assessment.

> Assessments are critical for classroom teachers as they guide our instruction. We are able to determine students' abilities as well as areas of weakness when we use such measurements. Authentic assessments are much more valid and accurate because they enable us to meet with the learner and observe them as we assess them. This is crucial because we can ask for more in-depth information if necessary, see the cueing or correction strategies they use when reading and writing, and see the overall attitude about the topic at hand. There is so much critical information that is lost when students are forced to pick A, B, C, or D on a multiple-choice test.

Teachers wrote about the advantages and disadvantages of assessing ASL competencies in addition to the standard assessment of English skills.

> Although there are some disadvantages to implementing assessment programs that include ASL competencies, there are far more advantages than using only standardized tests that are based on the deaf learner's second language. The two primary concerns in relation to using assessment tools that include standards for ASL competencies are as follows: (1) they are very time-consuming, and (2) they are subjective, as standards for criteria may be difficult to develop. These disadvantages are valid, but the advantages do outweigh them. Students deserve to be assessed in ways that meet their needs. We can't expect to maintain fairness if we teach them using both ASL and English and then only test them in their L2 (i.e., second language). We won't get a true picture of what they have accomplished or what

areas we need to reteach if we determine these areas based solely on their results from an English-based test.

A disadvantage in implementing an assessment program that includes ASL competencies is that not many teachers of the Deaf are proficient in ASL (both receptive and expressive). Not being proficient in ASL will affect the assessments of ASL competencies. But an advantage in implementing an assessment program that includes ASL competencies is that ASL is the Deaf's primary language. This prompts the appropriate placement for students and determines the students' area of need in improving either language. I have some students who are not proficient in their second language but excel in retelling stories in ASL.

Currently, I can only think of one disadvantage for the inclusion of ASL competencies. Anyone who uses the ASL competencies for assessment must be fluent in ASL. There are many times when a non-fluent ASL assessor uses the ASL competencies to determine the child's language competencies. This is unfair to the child and placement is inappropriate. It is critical to have a fluent ASL signer observe and assess the child's ASL competencies. This goes for anyone who uses the assessment tools, from a teacher to speech teacher to assessment analyst.

Of course, as with any program, there are disadvantages. The biggest disadvantage is time. This kind of assessment program requires double the amount of time, if not more. Of course, skilled users of ASL must be involved in the assessments. Most ASL-related assessments need to be conducted one-on-one (whereas written assessments are often done in groups). There are fewer assessment tools for ASL (compared to English). Teachers/assessment coordinators will (initially) have to do more work to find and develop assessment tools. New training will have to be done for teachers to conduct and interpret ASL assessments. Of course, ASL assessments are not as easily and quickly scored (you can't put a videotape in a bubble sheet scan machine). Assessment documentation is also bulkier--videotapes, portfolios, etc.

One of the advantages of including ASL competencies as a part of the assessment program is teachers can get more valuable and specific information about a learner's abilities. The results of standardized tests tend to draw negative attitudes and perspectives of a child if he scores low. The test may not be designed for the child, and it is inappropriate to use the results for placement criteria. Therefore, we need to use more valid assessment to "overcome" the inappropriate assessment tools and results. Assessing the child using his natural language helps the teacher become more sensitive to his needs.

Another advantage is that teachers can become more organized and prepare their instructional strategies and approaches to meet the learner's language development needs. Without the appropriate assessment tools, teachers cannot remember every learner's skills and needs. It makes it harder to meet each learner's needs. In addition, it is hard to initiate the assessment without the tools. In other words, teachers need guidelines and practices.

Reflective Log Question 3.9b: Assess the two students using *The Toolkit* (French, 1996b): "Appendix B." Write your reaction to the usefulness of the assessment. Also, comment on what you learned about your students as a result of this assessment.

In the second part of this reflection log assignment, teachers began to develop case studies of two of their students using the assessments from French's (1999b) *The Toolkit*. Following are some of the teachers' insights about their students that were gained as a result of assessing conversational proficiency.

> "A's" P-Level (proficiency level) is 6+. The checklist shows me that "A's" primary weaknesses are not in ASL. It is not a general language issue (language processing, etc.) that hinders his reading and writing abilities. His P-Level rating supports using ASL as a bridge to increase "A's" reading and writing skills. I am also now aware of areas that I need to observe more closely (7.1, 7.2 and 7.4). I have not observed "A" using these skills, but that does not mean that he does not have at least some degree of proficiency in them.
>
> "B's" P-Level is 3+, with almost all Level 4 and some Level 5 competencies observed. Even though I determined "B's" base level to be 3, I went ahead and assessed him on Levels 4, 5, and 6 because my observations of "B" indicate that he has significant gaps in his language development. I wanted to get the most accurate picture of his language usage as possible. Based on the checklists, "B" does demonstrate gaps. He has weaknesses in higher-level skills in the areas of form, cohesion, and reference. He needs to improve both his sign skills and his English reading and writing skills. I suspect that other issues in "B's" life have contributed to his uneven language development. I know that his family background is very unstable. He has been in and out of foster homes. I believe his language may be impacted by his emotional (and/or cognitive?) maturity. His social behaviors are immature for his age. All of this information, coupled with the checklists, helps provide me with a better idea of the areas I need to focus on in order to best help "B" progress.

Reflective Log Question 3.10a: What types of reading activities have you done or could you do for your own students to make reading meaningful and less dependent on word-for-word signing?

For this seminar, teachers read Livingston's (1997) chapter on avoiding signing text word-for-word and instead using ASL interpretation strategies during reading so students can access the full meaning of the text. Teachers brought to seminar text materials they used with students and, using Livingston's ASL interpretation strategies, practiced in small

groups, interpreting from English text to ASL to express the author's full meaning. In their reflective logs, teachers discussed the types of reading activities they used to make reading meaningful and less dependent on word-for-word signing.

> I use ASL so my students can understand the English content first. Sometimes, I would pause during reading and ask students some questions so I could keep track of their comprehension. If some of my students did not understand me, I would repeat by retelling or expanding information. Sometimes, the information in the book is beyond their prior experience. I would try to use an analogy that relates to their prior experience and to the story so they could understand parallel concepts.
>
> Sometimes during the reading of a story, I would start a paragraph and allow the student to pick up the second paragraph to read. My students often sign word-for-word, and I often ask them not to look at the sentence and to tell us what it means. Some of my students were able to translate it into ASL. Some struggled, and my students or I would assist them by signing the beginning of the sentence and allowing them to finish the last part in ASL.

Reflective Log Question 3.10b: How do you currently assess and determine your students' independent reading levels? Will your assessment methods change after reading "Appendix E?" (French, 1999b)

In the second part of this session, teachers reviewed two reading assessments described by French (1999a &b). French provided a checklist of various reading skills, including skills for emerging readers, beginning readers, alphabet knowledge, visual or listening comprehension, sight word vocabulary, effective use of cueing strategies (i.e., matching sign with print, using ASL and fingerspelling effectively), story retelling, reading comprehension strategies, and word analysis strategies. French also described Informal Reading Inventories (IRIs) which are used to identify the students' reading grade levels. IRIs are produced commercially and include graded reading passages with accompanying questions to assess comprehension.

Here are some of the teachers' descriptions of how they currently assessed and determined their students' independent reading levels. They also discussed how their

assessment methods would change after reading French's (1999b) Appendix E: "Determining a Student's Independent Reading Level" (using informal IRI's).

> I assess and determine my students' independent and instructional reading levels by using an Informal Reading Inventory. I use the San Diego Quick Assessment inventory, and the Brigance comprehension grade placement tests. At the beginning of the year, I also will look at my students' SAT scores in reading comprehension. I use the basal placement tests at the beginning and the end of the school year. Amazingly, most of the time, the assessment scores will correspond with each other and give me a general idea where the students are functioning. I like to sit down with the students and "read aloud" with them. I don't always have the luxury of extra time to assess each student by observation. I would like to take more time to learn how to keep a running record of errors as a student "reads aloud" in signs. I need more experience in doing a miscue analysis of my students.
>
> I recently have begun videotaping my students retelling a story they have just read in a guided reading session. I like to watch the tapes later and analyze if the students are remembering all the story elements. I have used Martha French's form on page 59 of *The Toolkit*. I am in the process of teaching my students what to include in a story retelling session. Later, I would like to use "retelling" as a tool to assess comprehension. I feel it is first important that the students know what elements belong in a retelling of a story. I plan later to use retelling as an assessment tool in determining comprehension level and reading grade level.

Reflective Log Question 3.11a: Using French's (1999b) "Reading Checklist" (Appendix C), assess the two students you have selected for the project. Write your reaction to the usefulness of the reading assessment. Also, comment on what you learned about your students as a result of this assessment. Please attach a copy of the completed assessment with this reflective log assignment.

Teachers used French's (1999b) "Reading Checklist" (Appendix C) to assess two of their students and then wrote their reactions to the usefulness of the reading assessment in their reflective logs. They also commented on what they learned about their students as a result of this assessment.

> A girl who is 10 years old and in the 4th grade has been with us for 4 or 5 years, and her language in ASL was above normal. She reads well, but has some areas that she needs to work on. Her reading comprehension in "making connections between sentences in cause and effect relationships" seems to be weak. She seems to be weak in recognizing pronoun referents and comprehending how prefixes change word meaning (like un-, re, dis-, etc.).

> She seemed to have difficulty comprehending how suffixes change word meaning (-s, -ing, -ly, etc.). Her story retelling seemed to be good. She knows how to recall and describe characters, time, and place, includes the major story problem, recalls major events, includes how problems were solved, gives the story ending, and demonstrates correct sequencing of important events.
>
> I performed the assessment test on two dorm students. I don't directly teach them in the classroom, but I spend time reading with them and I found some interesting things. I will talk about the 4th-grade student who is ten years old. His ASL and reading skills have grown considerably over the past two years. He seems to be weak in sight word vocabulary. He was unable to differentiate between nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. He also seems to be weak in retelling the story after we read together. I realized he needs to be taught how to retell a story. He had a hard time answering questions that were text-based. He needs more experience appropriately answering questions involving personal responses, although he has grown rapidly by interacting with peers and adults who sign directly with him.
>
> I think this is especially useful with lower readers, but not as useful with the higher level readers. It took a shorter time to implement the tool with the higher level students than with the lower. It provides me more information with my weaker students.

Reflective Log Question 3.12a: Based on your readings, participation in the seminars; and attempts to apply the research, theory, and assessments in your classroom, describe how this project has had an impact on your approach to working with deaf children.

In this final seminar of Level 3, teachers reflected on what they learned from this level. Based on their readings; participation in the seminars; and attempts to apply the research, theory, and assessment in their classroom, teachers described how this project had an impact on their approach to working with deaf children. Here are some teachers' reflections.

> After completing this project, it has had an impact on my approach to teaching deaf students in two ways. The first impact is in relation to my approach of assessing a variety of areas with deaf students. Because of the young age of my students, observations and interviews with parents have always been the main methods of assessment that I have utilized. However, up until participating in Star Schools this semester, I really had no formal way of documenting information or progress that I had obtained or noted during the assessment process. Now, however, I am able to

utilize many of the checklists that are offered in *The Toolkit* (French 1999b) as a way of documenting present levels, noting any delays, and writing appropriate goals and objectives. In addition, the various checklists help me to focus on important milestones for literacy development. For example, the checklists have stressed to me the importance of conversational language in children's literacy development.

The second way that Star Schools has impacted my approach to teaching deaf students this semester is the ASL Interpretation Strategies that we learned. After discussing these strategies, I have focused on trying to use more of the strategies more frequently in my classroom. I feel that these strategies have been especially beneficial for my students during story time.

The Star Schools Project has had a positive impact on me and on my teaching. I have gained valuable understanding of the meaning and implications of the bilingual aspects of my students. I now feel more qualified to assess my students' language skills. I especially feel more comfortable and competent explaining students' language(s) to their parents. I have also somewhat changed the way I teach reading and language. I believe strongly that we must use the natural ASL of the students to help them develop English.

Teachers then listed strengths of this project and areas that needed improvement. Strengths included learning about reading checklists, new uses of technology to teach the two languages, and hands-on experiences in the seminars.

Summary of Level 3 Training

During Level 3 of the training, teachers reflected on a variety of informal assessments they used with deaf students such as dialogue journals, storysigning, story retelling, etc. They discussed the importance of the cultural background of their students as well as their own teaching philosophy and views on assessment. Teachers discussed the challenges of assessing conversational ASL and written English. They discussed the issue of many deaf students having limited opportunities to learn language in their homes. They also discussed how the teacher's role is much like that of interpreters, frequently moving from ASL to English and from English to ASL. Finally, teachers started compiling case studies of two of their deaf students learning two languages—ASL and English.

Level 4: The Application of Bilingual Strategies and Assessments

In Level 4, teachers continued the training by focusing on the application of bilingual assessments and methodology. They continued to read chapters in Dixon-Krauss (1996), Fradd and McGee (1994), French (1999a, b), and Livingston (1997). Teachers continued to gather assessment data on their students in ASL and English.

Reflective Log Question 4.1a: Vygotsky (as cited in Dixon-Krauss, 1996) emphasized ZPD, semiotic mediation, conceptual development, and internalization. Analyze a previous lesson or activity you have done and show how one or more of these key principles was incorporated into that situation.

In this seminar, teachers discussed Vygotsky's (as cited in Dixon-Krauss, 1996) concepts: the zone of proximal development (ZPD), semiotic mediation, conceptual development, and internalization. A Vygotskian perspective on learning does not assume that students will initially learn on their own. Instead, students are guided by "knowledgeable others," such as parents, teachers, and more capable peers. The ZPD is a concept that refers to the distance between the child's actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the child's (higher) potential level of development as determined through problem solving supported by adult guidance or through collaboration with more capable peers. Simply put, it is the area where children can achieve a goal or accomplish a task with support and guidance from a more knowledgeable person (Dixon-Krauss, 1996). Semiotic mediation refers to the use of symbols, such as speech, signing, print, and numbers, that are developed by a culture to facilitate communication and thinking.

Here is one teacher's account of applying some of Vygotsky's principles to her lesson.

This week, we began a new thematic unit, "Pets." To introduce this unit, I chose a book titled, *Who Wants Arthur*? This is a story about an ordinary brown dog that lives in a pet shop. It is a wonderful piece of literature in that it introduces the idea of a variety of pets while showing the importance of "being yourself." Methods for introducing the story, relating the topic to learners' past experiences, and applying Vygotsky's semiotic mediation and zone of proximal development to class discussion/activities are discussed here. To gather baseline information about learner's past experiences related to which animals make good pets, we made a "good pets" class list. This gave me, "the more knowledgeable learner," a good idea of who had a solid understanding of what a pet is and who did not. Our class list included animals such as: dogs, cats, crabs, horses, pigs, and foxes. It was obvious that while some of the learners knew what kinds of animals made good pets, some were unclear. As we read the story, we noted the variety of pets that were in the pet store. While we discussed animals that were not listed, such as wild animals, it was neat to see the more knowledgeable learners discussing why animals such as raccoons, alligators, and elephants would not make good pets. I stepped back as much as possible and let the children discuss this idea among themselves. It was neat to observe.

This teacher also discussed how she used "scaffolding" (i.e., structuring a learning task and providing directions and guidance) as she worked with her student.

After we read the story, we played a card game: "Who, What, When, Where and Why?" On one side of an index card, I wrote one of the "W" words, and on the back I wrote a related "W" question connected to the story. All of the learners were able to answer the "recall" or lower-level questions without much assistance, but the more analytical/higher-level question forms, such as the "Why" questions, were difficult for many and required more scaffolding.

Reflective Log Question 4.1b: Dixon-Krauss' Chapter 9 (1996, p. 153) discusses the concept of mediated reading instruction, such as the use of probing questions to support comprehension. How do you mediate your students' reading? Give some specific examples.

One of the teachers described how she provided a model of reading and contextual support in the process of mediating her students' reading.

In our fifth grade class, I (Language Arts teacher) teamed with the Social Studies teacher. A few weeks ago, she taught about the American Revolution, and I read a story aloud about King George from England struggling with the idea of Americans not wanting to be part of England. The book required four days of reading (30 minutes each day), as I used an overhead projector. Then, Ms. A showed a videotape about the American Revolution. The students were able to relate the

> movie to the story I read aloud. Ms. A had some students pretend to be news anchors from England and America telling what was going on. We used the digital camcorder to videotape them. After doing those activities, some students picked up the book and read by themselves.
>
> Another teacher described how she mediates the reading of her preschool students.
>
> Storytelling is commonly used in my classroom and I mediate my students' abilities to read through drawings, fingerspelling and writing activities. This enables them to see printed text and vocabulary elsewhere. They become able to recognize and understand them. Mediating reading may be different for preschoolers than it is for most grade levels in elementary. I always encourage preschoolers to read books of their choice and explore the pictures. I take the time to sit with each one and discuss what he/she has learned or seen in the book. Probing is one of my favorite techniques to use. I find it a useful technique because it enables the students to develop thinking skills and to communicate expressively.

Reflective Log Question 4.2a: Your practice of language separation in the classroom has been questioned. Justify your stance. Are there any occasions when a concurrent use of two languages might be beneficial? If so, please explain.

For this seminar, teachers read chapters by Jacobson (1990) and a chapter by Baker (1996) related to the allocation (concurrent use and separation) of two languages in the classroom. Teachers read about how, where, and when two languages can be integrated and separated in the bilingual classroom. Teachers examined the different reasons for integrating or separating the two languages. For instance, when a teacher presents information in the students' second language, she may want to ensure comprehension or reinforce a concept by repeating the information in the students' first language. This is an example of how the teacher may use two languages concurrently, integrating them into one lesson. According to Baker, teachers can use two languages concurrently by switching to the other language for specific purposes, such as reinforcing concepts, reviewing information, capturing the students' attention, praising, changing the topic, changing the material, gaining rapport, or because they or the students are tired.

In another instance, if the purpose of a "bilingual" program is to shift language use toward the majority language, then teachers may plan to separate the two languages and use only the majority language during a lesson. If the purpose is to maintain the minority language in addition to developing the majority langauge, then teachers may want to separate and use the two languages at different times or during different lessons. Second language researchers support the separation of the two languages so that the child gets a clear model of both. Languages can be separated in the classroom depending on topic, subject, and person using the language (Baker, 1996).

Here are two teachers' reflections on the benefits of both language separation and concurrent use of ASL and English.

> The practice of language separation in the classroom is important for students to appropriately develop both languages. While we need to help the students develop skill and competency in English for the purpose of literacy, we must continue to foster their development of ASL for communication, social, and cultural purposes.
>
> Concurrent use of both languages is beneficial for literacy development. For example, in order for students to become truly competent readers and writers of English, we must use ASL, their natural language, to explain the English text so they will comprehend and hopefully internalize it. By the same token, providing English text for topics discussed in ASL will strengthen students' ability to use both languages competently in both academic and non-academic situations.

Reflective Log Question 4.2b: Chapter 11 in Dixon-Krauss (1996) discusses the application of technology to literacy instruction. Describe how you have incorporated the use of technology to facilitate ASL and English acquisition and learning for your deaf students. How have these applications benefited your students' language and literacy development?

The teachers mentioned a variety of technologies they used to facilitate literacy in the classroom.

> I am excited about the technology I have brought to my classroom. I had used the digital camera for several years and thought it beneficial in many ways. I have now found many uses for the SMARTBoard. One area I use the SMARTBoard regularly

is in social studies. We are currently learning about each of the 50 states. Instead of handouts and overheads, I have started introducing the material using Coral Presentations. The students love learning using the different techniques on the screen. They are motivated and remember so much more. I also am able to copy what they see on the board and give them the notes. I sign to the students what is in print. Our discussions are held in ASL, but all print before them is in English. They are becoming more and more skilled in their reading and more comfortable translating what they have read to ASL to show its rich meaning.

In my classroom, I still use the overhead projector to enhance literacy instruction. During direct reading instruction, I project the text on the wall as the class and I read and discuss the English text, its meaning and interpretation. I also project the text in the same way when the students take turns signing the text themselves. The entire class can see both the English text and the signer at the same time. During content area instruction, such as Social Studies, I use the overhead projector to project printed English of the concepts we discuss in ASL. This is the area in which I need to update my use of technology by making use of Presentations on the computer in conjunction with the SMARTBoard. I feel this will encourage more student involvement and increase their motivation and participation. This is my goal for this semester.

In the classroom, the students use the computer to type stories that they wrote themselves (in order to publish their own books). We also use the Internet to read about different events/topics. We videotape students reading books and retelling stories. When they type their stories and read information on the Internet, they are reading and writing English. When the students read their books, they are reading English. When they retell stories, they are using ASL.

Internet- My students write me an e-mail and I respond back. If students do not understand my answer or question, I repeat the answer or question in ASL so they can continue communicating with me. Camcorder- My students read in English and discuss in ASL, then retell in front of the camcorder. Digital Camera- My students take a picture of an item or a person and type up a text next to the picture. Students could explain their projects in ASL. CD-ROM- My students used that a lot, especially when trying to figure out what a word means. They would go into the ASL dictionary and type a word and view a person signing the word. Word Processor- My students type their text in English on the computer. I ask them to tell me what they typed (using scaffolding or mediating). Inspirational Program (used to create web maps)- My students draw maybe two or three circles so they can print the sheet and glue a specific word, i.e., "Right," and glue three different "Right' signs that are spelled the same but have different meanings.

Reflective Log Question 4.3a: Livingston (1997, p. 112) strongly believes it is not beneficial to compare the grammar of English and ASL as an instructional technique. What are your thoughts and teaching practices in relation to this idea?

In her book, *Rethinking Deaf Education*, Livingston (1997) cautioned against relying on a grammar approach in teaching language and literacy. Instead, she recommends that teachers focus on meaning and use interpretation strategies, like those of ASL interpreters, when expressing the meaning of English text. Here are some teachers' comments.

> I understand Livingston's point about not wanting to mix ASL grammar and English grammar when teaching children to write. However, depending on the age of the student and the grammatical concept being covered, I believe some comparisons not only could but should be made. Our students are using ASL, a language that differs from English in many grammatical respects. As children begin to write they put down what they sign. When their writing is revised they must wonder why they can sign it one way, but must write it another. When faced with this kind of question, I always show my students how meaning in ASL is conveyed and how the same meaning is conveyed in English. I don't take a lot of time with it, just point it out to the students. An example would be the use of adjectives (ASL -girl - tall) - (English - tall girl). Another situation we face is that many of our students are not only learning English but they are also learning ASL. They are trying to acquire two languages. Comparing some of the features of both languages, from my experience, has helped the students gain not only a better understanding but also a respect for both languages.

> When I first read the question (before reading Livingston), I wasn't sure whether or not I agreed. I felt that in some ways, it might be beneficial. For example, when I was explaining figurative language, I wrote "all right", then signed it as it would be signed literally (in MCE). After that, I signed it again in ASL and the students were quick to catch on the meaning. However, after I read Livingston, I realized that she meant grammar only…. I am in complete agreement. I believe it is beneficial to teach ASL grammar but why would we want to compare this to English grammar? If I explained to the students that "fly" and "airplane" have different movements in ASL because one word is a noun and the other is a verb, they would go, "oh." Then if I explained nouns and verbs in English, I do not see a way in which the ASL noun-verb information would help. If our kids have extensive exposure to good models in both languages, I believe they will naturally be able to separate and analyze the grammatical components of each.

I'm in agreement with Livingston regarding the comparison of English and ASL grammar. To begin with I'm not a native ASL signer and therefore not qualified to make such comparisons. With that aside, if I were a native ASL signer I would still not make the comparisons. Grammatical rules of two languages would be very difficult to try to assimilate into one's working knowledge. At the fifth grade level, I expose my students to general grammar lessons where all students seem to be having difficulties. I tend to work with students individually on specific and sometimes repetitive errors or weaknesses within their own writing samples. I find that this is more effective and meaningful to the individual student(s).

Reflective Log Question4.3b: How do you use the mediation model described in Dixon-Krauss (1996, see Figure 1.2, p. 21) to maximize your students' reading and writing experiences?

I use the mediation model in all my reading and writing lessons. I just did not have a name for it. The first thing I do is to find a purpose for reading or writing. I try to answer the "why" questions. Why are my students involved in this activity? Why do I think they need this skill? Why is this text a good choice? Then, I look at the strategies my students already have in place, the strategies they are currently developing, and the strategies they still need to learn. I try to pick the strategies that will best help my students understand the text. I, then, reflect on what my students did or didn't do. I use the information to adjust the strategies. I monitor and reflect throughout the reading or writing activity. What are the students doing right, what do they need help with, how can I better support the students and bring meaning to the text while helping them develop strategies for reading and writing? This is an ongoing process throughout the lesson.

The mediation model is a dynamic model of social interaction between the students and the teacher. In writing workshop, I feel we do use the mediation model to some degree. We depend on social interaction to receive positive feedback and suggestions to improve our writing. My students present their manuscripts to their peers by interpreting the information in ASL and then showing the manuscript on the overhead on a transparency. The student presenting chooses a secretary to record all the questions and suggestions from other students. The audience asks clarification questions. Also students are encouraged to give suggestions to the author. Suggestions might help make the piece more interesting or appealing to their future audience. Students think about the six traits of writing, and point out positive uses of word choice, ideas, or organization. Positive feedback is stressed at this point. Students need encouragement in their writing. The secretary records all information to later help the student author. This information is valuable in revising, and editing the final copy.

Reflective Log Question 4.4a: It is important to reflect on the ultimate purpose for writing: to communicate meaningfully with another person. With this purpose in mind, discuss your views on syntax and spelling. How can you make learning these skills a meaningful task for children?

In this chapter (Dixon-Krauss, 1996) teachers learned more about how to make children's writing authentic and purposeful for them. According to Dixon-Krauss, one way in which writing becomes purposeful is to have an audience and publish students' writing. Teachers read about the six activities of writing: prereading activities, drafting, conferencing with others, revision, editing, and publishing. Children can be led to see the importance of writing in their own lives, not only in the language arts class, but writing for its own sake and writing as a response to literature.

Teachers reflected on how they make learning the conventions of writing meaningful for students.

> I agree with Dixon-Krauss that the act of publishing students' work is probably one of the best ways to make formal writing more meaningful to students. My students are much more concerned about their writing when they know it is going to be viewed by a large audience, e.g., articles for the School Progress, a commentary in the yearbook, or information for our school's website. My students will come up to me and ask about word choices that convey the correct meaning of their "message" along with a request for an edit of their work. I often joke with my students that they are more concerned with their English in this class than in their actual English classes! If I were teaching Language Arts, I think I would encourage more viewing of students' work in order to make the students feel that learning and maintaining formal writing skills are indeed a necessity. There would be postings of student work in the hallways, a school literacy magazine, entries to local and/or national writing contests, a class newsletter, contributions to an Internet-based literacy e-zine, poetry readings, and more. There are just so many ways to share student work with the public and I think that if students know their work is being viewed, they will make more of an effort for better writing form.
>
> Thinking back to my own school days, it seems there was nothing worse than copying meaningless sentences and paragraphs just to prove that I understood the rules of punctuation and that I could spell words correctly. I certainly do not want to continue the same pattern of learning in my own classroom. This

year I have tried a couple of activities which are interrelated and seem to be successful. First, I gave the students some drawing assignments early in the year. I wanted them to get used to doing assignments outside of the classroom and I wanted to get their creative juices flowing in a non-threatening way. The assignments were not graded but the drawings were shared and discussed in class. Now, from time to time, I pick one of the drawings and develop a question related to it and the students are asked to respond to the question in writing. For example, early in the year the students were asked to draw the largest ice cream sundae in the world. Later, they were asked to write a letter explaining who they want to invite to accompany them to a restaurant to eat the world's largest sundae. When the creative writing assignments were complete, we shared the ideas as a class. In our sharing, we discussed ways in which the ideas could be presented more clearly in their written form The students themselves suggested noun-verb agreements, punctuation, spelling, etc. without labeling the changes as such. All the writings were shared and each example needed some kind of change so this was a non-threatening activity for the students. It was student-centered, with the original writings and the suggestions for change coming from the students themselves, not from the teacher. Additionally, the students have daily language worksheets which they are asked to complete independently. I develop the worksheets, using examples of their own writing and highlighting common errors, such as missing punctuation. The number of errors for each worksheet is stated for the students. They are then responsible for finding the errors and rewriting the sentences in their error-free form. At the end of the week, the daily worksheets are evaluated. Any errors which were not changed correctly are discussed individually with each student. The students take pride in finding and correcting the errors on their own. As the days and weeks go by, the students are discovering patterns and forming rules for punctuation, syntax and spelling. The rules are much more meaningful and are internalized.

Reflective Log Question 4.4b: Discuss how gathering information about your students' current writing levels using "Appendix D: Kendall Writing Levels" (French, 1999b) helps you plan instruction to meet individual students' needs more effectively.

In this session, teachers discussed how to assess the writing levels of deaf students using the Kendall Writing Levels Assessment (French, 1999b). The writing assessment corresponds to French's four stages of literacy: Emergent Literacy, Beginning Literacy, Developing Literacy, and Maturing Literacy. Within these four stages are eight writing levels. Students' writing is evaluated according to meaning, use of conventions of writing, linguistic features, and story development.

Here is one teacher's response concerning the writing assessment.

> We have used the Kendall Writing Levels in our school for several years now. The assessment helps me know what I need to focus on. Are capital letters being used; are letters formed right; is spacing between words acceptable? Is my student attempting prepositions? Is he/she using articles? Is there an attempt at writing ideas or just letters and numbers? All of this information helps me see where I need to direct class lessons and what I need to focus on more.

Reflective Log Question 4.5a: Describe one (or more) activity(s) in which you have integrated ASL, reading, writing, and fingerspelling?

In this seminar, teachers discussed Livingston's ideas (1997) about integrating signing, reading, and writing in the subject areas.

> The successful integration of ASL, reading, writing, and fingerspelling is one of the keys to literacy development in deaf children. As a teacher, I need to always be looking at the content that I teach with literacy development in mind. Whatever we teach, Science, Social Studies, Math, or Physical Education, we always must be looking for ways to integrate both languages.
>
> In Science there are many opportunities for integration. We recently held our school's Science Fair. As part of the scientific process, students started off their projects with a question to answer. "Can a seed grow without light?" Students then researched written material prior to making an educated guess (their hypothesis). After their research and hypothesis, they designed and conducted an experiment. They wrote up their experiment in a report and created a display board explaining their experiment. Finally, they set up their displays and explained their projects to judges, other classes, and family members using ASL. Their final grade reflected all components of their project, their research (reading), their report and display (writing), and their presentations, (ASL).
>
> In third grade, we do thematic teaching that enables us to teach using the same theme (for the most part) across the curriculum. This seems to build the students' interests, and they get a firm grasp on the topics at hand. Currently, our theme is pancakes, in honor of National Pancake Week. We read one introductory story in Language Arts, and now the students are writing their own versions of the story *Pancakes for Breakfast*. It is a picture book that does not have any words. First, the students took turns creating a story (in ASL) to match the pictures. Once they felt comfortable with the use of ASL and fingerspelling, the students were able to start creating their own written versions of the story. They are working together to maintain consistency and accuracy in the story. When they have completed their stories, we will put them together and have matching pictures for each page. Then, the students

will take turns reading the story they have produced. It has been a wonderful experience thus far, and I have been able to have mini-conferences with the students to target specific skills that they need to improve. They like the idea of working together, and it is risk-free since there is no original text that can limit them. At the conclusion of this unit, we will make pancakes as a class. I will use that time to assess them and what they have learned as part of this unit. They will be required to read a recipe, follow directions, and use appropriate turn-taking skills as part of the activity.

Reflective Log Question 4.5b: Collect (or examine already collected) writing samples of your two students (for your Language/Literacy Project). Review these writing samples. Identify these students' writing levels using "Appendix D": Kendall Writing Levels (French, 1999b). Choose one student and develop a mini-lesson that will address a specific need in this student's writing development. Attach scanned copies of these writing samples to the reflective log.

Here are two teachers' responses to assessing the writing behaviors of a deaf bilingual student.

To celebrate African American History Month, we had a guest speaker. She came dressed as Harriet Tubman and told the story of her life as a slave and as a conductor on the Underground Railroad. The interpreted presentation fascinated my students. I asked them, as a homework assignment, to write a story about Harriet Tubman. The results far exceeded my expectations. I used the language samples to assess writing levels of KH and MB. KH did a nice job getting her ideas on paper. The message, however, was difficult to determine at times, especially to a reader who was not familiar with the guest speaker's presentation. KH was attempting to use a variety of sentence patterns, which may have made the message more difficult to reconstruct. She attempted English word order and used pronouns, articles, and adjectives in her writing. KH used conventional spelling, some capitalization, some punctuation, and good spacing. KH was able to describe events and included some feelings of the characters. Based on my analysis, I would say KH is writing at Level 5. MB's writing sample contained fewer errors. There were some verb agreement errors, verb tense errors, a few article and prepositional errors, and a few vocabulary errors. Based on my analysis of MB's sample, I would say MB is writing at Level 8. As a mini-lesson for MB, I would have her work on irregular past tense of verbs. This is an area with which most students struggle, hearing or deaf. In my lesson with MB, I would review the general rule that "ed" is added to verbs to form the past tense. I would remind her, however, that there are a number of exceptions to the rule. I would demonstrate how a dictionary lists the irregular forms of verbs in a definition. When in doubt, MB would have a source to verify her decision. I would ask MB to begin a past tense verb log. Using a variety of printed sources - the

newspaper, reading books, subject area text books - I would ask MB to find irregular past tense verbs and add them to her past tense verb log.

Writing samples analyzed: student # 1 story titled "A Mystery" is at the developing level with most components on level 6. Student # 2 story titled "I have a Flubber" is at the beginning level with most components on level 5. Because I have often seen weak beginning opening sentences with the basic sentence pattern, "One man, boy, or girl named _____", I have chosen student # 2's story to develop a mini-lesson. (This student is a very creative ASL storyteller making up stories as she goes along, captivating her audience.) In her written work, I don't see the same flare for storytelling as signed through the air. This student needs exposure to some sample opening character identifiers. She needs practice writing different opening story starters. To begin with, she needs to be shown different story starters that begin with introduction of the main character. Depending on the kind of story the student is writing, it might function better with a different opening to set the tone or mood. A short session together on brainstorming different ways to introduce the character would be beneficial to make this student aware of how to improve the story. Several practice samples of the same story would be needed to enable this student to see the many ways the story could begin with a more interesting opening. Then, with the use of a thesaurus, the student could begin to replace the simple words with more creative descriptive adjectives. Having a good beginning will also help this student become more enthusiastic with continuing and making the story more enjoyable to the reader/audience.

Reflective Log Question 4.6a: What are the current grading/assessment approaches in your school and in your classroom? How can a collaborative approach be applied to assessment at your school?

In this seminar, teachers read French's (1999a) chapter about how to involve others in the assessment process. Teachers discussed why it was important to involve other teachers, administrators, staff, parents, and other students in the assessment process to gain a complete picture of the students' language proficiencies. They also discussed the benefits of putting together portfolios or samples of students' work.

Here are some teachers' descriptions of some of their current assessment procedures.

In our classroom, we use a lot of work samples as a basis for "grading" judgments. We also use the portfolio to assess growth over the course of a year. These are both very useful to us. Another way we assess learner

progress is through observation and anecdotal records. We have often times used these during parent conferences to support our statements and judgments. For our reading assessment, we are presently using the Fairview program, which I have written about in previous logs. Using this program, we can take advantage of their organized assessment procedures to keep track of basic sight word and phrase recognition, as well as concepts about books and print.

At the present, my class is focusing on word choice and ideas. We have been assessing paragraphs written by both hearing and deaf children. My students read each selection and then give a score ranging from 1 to 5. We have class discussion and compare the scores that were given and why. We also have been assessing stories that have been written in writing workshops by the students themselves. Students must be willing to volunteer their papers in order for them to be critiqued by the class. Then each classmate gives a score to the paper and explains their supporting reasons. This is a very positive and reinforcing activity. This assessment gives the students an opportunity to be reflective participants with their own papers and papers written by their classmates. This activity also reinforces social interaction and academic ASL language. Therefore, the children are actively engaged in the assessment and become contributors of the assessment process.

Here is a teacher's reflection on how a collaborative approach could be applied to assessment.

How can a collaborative assessment approach be applied to the assessment at our school? Wow! This is a hot and sensitive subject. In a perfect world, teams who work with a particular child would sit down, objectively to discuss learner strengths and weaknesses and come up with an assessment that all can reasonably agree upon. However, as we all know, this is not a perfect world, and objectivity and fairness do not always reign. In my opinion, this is an area of weakness in my department. People who are not objective and/or who are unqualified to make sound assessments, due to the lack of time spent with a learner or to a lack of competent communication skills (or both) are making independent critical assessments which become a part of the learner's permanent file. I would love to see a team approach where everyone who works with the child, parents, teachers, aides, and ancillary service people, all give objective and meaningful input. One thing that I think is of primary importance, is that people in diagnostic and speech/language positions should have exemplary skills in both expressive and receptive ASL areas. I think often that children's scores are misrepresented due to the fact that the learner could not understand the adult administering the assessment or was misunderstood him or herself. I would like to see some changes occur.

Reflective Log Question 4.6b: Summarize the results of the completed "Parent Surveys" and "Student Surveys" (French, 1999b "Appendix F") of your two students. Reflect on the impact this information will have on your teaching. Be ready to share your findings at the seminar.

Some teachers discussed what they learned about a subset of their students as a result of the parent and student surveys.

> In looking at the information from the parent survey, one thing stood out. Parent #1 reported that she read with her son and helped him with his reading. Parent #2 reported that he does not communicate well with his son and never reads with him or helps him read. The student whose parent shows a real interest in helping him read, student #1, has improved a great deal and is continuing to show improvement. Student #2, whose parent does not show any interest or help, has difficulty with reading and has not progressed as rapidly. It reinforces my belief that the parents' attitude and willingness to jump in and read with the student are very important. Parent #1 reported on her survey that her son has a tendency to avoid difficult material. He never reads difficult material. She wants him to realize that it is better for him to struggle through the material as that is part of the learning process. Parent #2 reports that his son only likes to look at picture books and does not read much. All they do together is watch TV. In the student interview, student #1 told me that he likes to read as long as the book is not too hard. He enjoys books because they make him laugh. He reads captions on the TV, which he thinks, are easy to read. However he reports his Science book and Social Studies book are difficult. He uses the QAR reading strategy. Student #2 finds it hard to read. He does not enjoy reading hard books. He does not use any strategies. The information gained from these surveys will impact my teaching in several ways. Student #1 needs to be taught additional strategies, which would help him attack more difficult material. Since his mother is very involved in his reading, she should be shown the strategies as well. Student #2 is a more difficult challenge. It will be hard for his dad to just start reading with his son since communication is a barrier. I might suggest, that since he and his son watch TV together, that dad makes sure the captions are turned on. Dad could encourage his son to read as much of the captions as he could. At school, student #2 needs constant reinforcement and encouragement in his reading. He needs to be around other readers in the dorm or before or after school. If I could find a volunteer to come in once a week and read with the student to try and instill pleasure in reading, it would help this student.

Reflective Log Question 4.7a: French (1999, Chapter 4) and Fradd and McGee (1994, Chapter 7) described a collaborative approach to assessment. Describe how you are using this approach in your own assessment practices. How could you improve upon your present practice?

In this session, teachers continued their discussion of how they collaborate with others in assessing students and how they could improve that process.

> With the collaborative approach, I currently refer to several resources. The resources are the student's previous year portfolios, formal test results from the previous year, student's current I.E.P., and input from the other team teacher…. With the team teacher, we share the same lesson plans. Prior to preparing lesson plans, we would discuss the pre-assessment and the post-assessment, such as written tests, oral presentation, and other informal tests.
>
> To improve my present practices -- (1) I could use a few more assessments by using rubrics more often for the students to respond in ASL and for me to determine how much a student understands from reading the text. This year, in my Language Arts class, I relied on written tests. (2) Slow down on reading, because I had students read several stories, yet didn't provide enough "hands-on" activities. I will work on activities, such as retelling in ASL and using videotapes more often for assessing. (3) Another way to improve is to work with the other two teachers (Social Studies/Science and Math) to determine a student's potential in other areas.

Reflective Log Question 4.7b: Considering the importance of obtaining measures of a deaf student's academic achievement in English and ASL, discuss how you are obtaining some of these measurements in your educational setting. How do you collaborate with others to accomplish this?

> The teachers continued their discussion of collaboration and assessment.
>
> I feel it is very important to obtain measures of a deaf student's academic achievement in English and ASL. I currently assess students depending on their levels of English and ASL. For example, every two weeks or so, students are required to finish book projects. I realize that not all students are ready to read a novel independently and then create a project containing specified information. Students who are not ready for that are given the option of watching/reading ASL stories on videotape and doing a retelling. To determine the accurateness of their retelling, I usually pull in someone else who is more skilled with ASL to help me evaluate them. This has proven to be very effective.
>
> Yes, using measures of a deaf student's academic achievement in English and ASL is crucial. However, I strongly feel that we had an unqualified person who did diagnostic assessment on our students at our school for many years. I

believe many reports on our students are inaccurate. I think we are fortunate to have a new diagnostic assessor who can communicate fluently using students' primary language, ASL. Reports will be accurate and include child's language, culture and values. I look forward to the new files because I will be able to use them to determine strengths and areas that need to be improved in my students.

It applies to ASL. Across the nation, we educators still struggle to design and find an ideal ASL assessment so we can evaluate our students' primary language. We are not able to do it well. I am still in search of an appropriate ASL assessment form that I can use with my students. For now, I use different samples of ASL assessments I have with me to assess students' ASL and report to a specific teacher who requested that I evaluate their students. I still struggle with some information missing from ASL assessment. For example, not all of them cover function, form, and content areas.

I depend on Language Art teachers for information on students they work with who happened to be my students as well. I get information on what grade level my student can read so that I can pick appropriate books for her. That helps me do well as a teacher and helps my student be able to do work in the classroom.

I believe my school does not have a formal measurement of achievement in ASL. This year, I have used Kendall Toolkit to determine the level of the student's achievement in ASL, and I found the Kendall Toolkit an excellent tool to measure my students' achievement in ASL. It gives me insight into the student's strengths and needs.

The checklists in the Kendall Toolkit also give me an idea where the students' present aptitudes should be. The Kendall Toolkit provides a clear explanation of what the student can do and what improvements the student needs to focus on.

Reflective Log Question 4.8a: Chapter 10 from Dixon-Krauss (1996) discussed the framework for using portfolios to mediate instruction and assessment. French (1999a) described the relevance and relationships among the three levels of assessment and record keeping: student level, teacher level, and program level. Discuss the strengths and needed improvements of these levels of assessment at your school.

In this session, teachers were given more opportunities to discuss assessment of deaf bilingual students after reading Chapter 10 in Dixon-Krauss (1996). Teachers described weaknesses in portfolio use and improvements they felt were needed in order to use portfolios more effectively.

Currently, I am not satisfied with the portfolio assessment that I am keeping. I have a lot of information that I've gathered through observation that I have not been consistent with in terms of documentation. I already have forms ready for me to use, but I find them to be time-consuming. When it comes down to it, I have a hard time justifying my priority of writing about the lesson and the students' performance over the need to plan more instruction and create materials. What is a teacher to do?

Portfolio assessment at our school, to my knowledge, has only existed for three years. It originated when I was a student teacher, and I was impressed with the amount of planning and thought that was put into this innovative method of assessment. Since that time, two years ago, there has been less and less description of how portfolio assessment is supposed to work, and there has not been much leadership or direction in terms of planning from the program's perspective. What has resulted, unfortunately, is a lack of consistency between teachers, and new teachers are relatively unaware of their responsibilities in terms of ensuring that this is a smooth, well-planned process that occurs over time. Currently, the teacher in kindergarten starts with two poster boards taped together that create a big portfolio. First grade adds a folder to that, and second grade does the same. What has resulted is huge stacks of portfolios that are difficult to store and overwhelming to look at.

I have proposed, on several occasions, that we revert back to the planning stages and have a more efficient system for implementing portfolios. I think it would be wonderful if each student was provided with a 3-inch notebook that already had tab dividers for each of the grade levels in elementary. Then, it could be passed along to the new classroom teacher every year. They are much easier to store and add to than the space-consuming folders and poster board pockets currently in use. Also, I feel that this consistency would enable learners to become more familiar with the concept of portfolios and what their role is in terms of selecting work and monitoring growth. We could include examples of large projects or oversized papers by taking a picture of them with a digital camera, scanning them, and then asking the students to reflect on their assignment. That way, the picture can be included and we would not be forced to store large projects that are difficult to manage over time.

Reflective Log Question 4.8b: Explain your current level of implementation of a comprehensive assessment program and how you plan to expand upon it.

Teachers continued to discuss assessment issues and how they might apply the ideas from the readings to their work with deaf bilingual students.

Current level assessment program - there are several methods, and they are mostly based on informal tests. Improvements needed for me, as a teacher, are to convince my students' previous teacher to sit with me, go over the portfolios, and discuss the strengths and needs in order to get a general idea of students' present competencies. In addition, especially this - record the observations as soon as I find the time (no

more mental recording)! To expand my assessment program, I will use the record keeping from the Kendall Toolkit.

Reflective Log Question 4.9a: You have been doing ongoing assessment on two students for your project using *The Toolkit* (French, 1999b). How have the assessment results of the students' conversational ASL and reading and writing skills influenced your instruction for these students?

Teachers reflected on how their instruction changed based on the results of the assessments of their students.

> I am more aware of what the students are conveying to each other. I pay attention to whether or not they are using repetitious signing because, if they are doing that, then I'd use that as a chance to expose them to other ASL or English skills. One of my students has really weak conversational ASL (both receptive and expressive). I'd allow more time to ask her questions about what she has to say or rephrase what she said. All in all, this student needs a lot of modeling, whether it's ASL or English.
>
> I think the biggest area of influence in my instruction comes from The Reading Checklist (Appendix C). I have created my own rubric using the story retelling checklist. I videotape my lower level readers often in retelling stories. This helps me evaluate comprehension of the stories read in class. In the beginning stages, the components of retelling had to be taught. Now retelling can be used as a tool to measure comprehension of English print….I created a student notebook where I keep running records of students' progress, especially in reading. As a result of assessment in Star Class, I feel that I am beginning to use observational assessment to obtain information from my students more than I did before. I also am more aware of effective and ineffective strategies that my students are using when reading.
>
> The assessments in the toolkit gave me valuable information. In writing, one of the students ranked low in the area of meaning due to problems in organization and detail. I structured several mini-lessons designed to help him improve his organizational skills. As follow up, I am also looking at that part of his writing with a more critical eye…. As for reading, I picked up, both from the parent/student survey and the reading assessment itself, that a student was avoiding reading more challenging material due to lack of vocabulary. This student will be given several reading strategies (using the context and monitoring comprehension) to help him improve his vocabulary acquisition and subsequently his comprehension of more challenging material.
>
> Of my students that I have assessed, one student has a weaker base language, having grown up as the only deaf person in her family and having been mainstreamed until coming to our school last year. I have adjusted several situations to benefit her ASL social skills. My daily awareness and sensitivity

towards their educational needs in all academic areas have been heightened. During content areas, such as science and social studies, we seem to discuss more and, where in some situations I might have skipped an activity, I now plan and incorporate those activities that would allow for weaker skills to improve. I also am more in tune with pairing students for activities where students can complement each other with their strengths, helping students who are weak in certain areas. Within the writing process, I now try to incorporate more free writing and more sharing time for feedback from peers, realizing the need to make the writing process enjoyable and not a timed, labor session. I have begun a literature reading circle instead of traditional, daily, guided reading sessions using the overhead projector. I find that the class has begun writing more in response journals than the former responses I was getting from formatted story questions. I also allow more discussion so the more capable reader can share insights from the story that the others might have missed or overlooked. In general, now there is more and deeper discussion for all my students, not only those two that I more deeply assessed through the French Toolkit.

The assessment process has...expanded, broadened, and redefined my view of the education of young deaf children. I examined our daily routine to note where and how ASL and English were being used and what techniques were being used. Then I decided what could be added or changed. I am more aware of opportunities for both languages to be acquired. I look for those "teachable" moments and seek to embed both languages within activities. This process has increased team interaction through discussion of, not only the assessment, but also the planning process.

Reflective Log Question 4.9b: Review the "Guidelines for Planning and Instruction for Literacy" (French, 1999a, pp. 161-176) and provide some personal reflections about how you could apply at least two of these guidelines.

Teachers reflected on how to use French's (1999a) guidelines for planning and instruction for literacy of deaf students. French (1999a) offered seven guidelines:

- Take into account a broad view of literacy and the interdependency of various areas of development (e.g., conversational language, background knowledge).
- Base planning and instruction on the students' individual patterns of growth according to universal stages of development (e.g., focus on skills and knowledge students do not already possess and for which they are developmental ready).
- Ensure that conversational language is fully accessible and meaningful.

- Plan language use during instruction so that it corresponds to students' language needs, goals, and competencies.
- Rather than assume children must learn to read and write before they can learn in other areas, put learning literacy in perspective with other important educational goals (e.g., communicative competence, background knowledge).
- Implement a structured, balanced framework of activities for teaching reading and writing consistently throughout the school program (e.g., allow for learning through acquisition, as well as instruction).
- Rather than adhere to a hierarchical system of teaching reading, select reading and writing instructional goals according to important skills and strategies that individuals need (including both bottom-up and top-down processing of print).

This is what one teacher wrote about how she could apply some of French's (1999a) guidelines.

> The third guideline struck me as a key component to any educational program for a deaf child: full, clear, and consistently accessible conversational language used in a variety of ways with students engaged in meaningful dialogue. When an observer sets foot in my classroom, language is visible everywhere. There are posters, banners, signs, written work, word cards, …throughout the room. If the observer has time to stay for awhile, he/she would notice that language is also "visible" throughout my person. I firmly believe in sharing with my students. We discuss our lives, our feelings, our goals, our dreams, our fears, and our disappointments. We are not a group with the teacher at the helm and the students rowing desperately to keep their heads above water. We are a unit with shared experiences. I believe the "non-academic" discussions are as valuable in the overall development of the students as any discussion regarding the causes of the Revolutionary War. According to the sixth guideline, a structured, balanced program of activities for teaching reading and writing should be implemented throughout the program. The activities should represent a balance between the ways that students learn, through acquisition and with instruction, and take into account their individual differences. The students and I enjoy "read aloud" sessions. We have all noticed a significant increase in reading comprehension as a result of these shared experiences. We also enjoy shared writing and editing experiences. The students feel safe with each other and any suggestions for improvement are not interpreted as criticism, but constructive suggestions for improvement. When the students are helping each other, either in developing the original written work or in editing written work, they seem to understand the necessary changes and retain the information better. It becomes important to them and they take ownership in the learning taking place.

Reflective Log Question 4.10a: Describe what you are doing to establish and maintain clear communication with the parents of your two students regarding their current levels of functioning and the school's ongoing efforts to meet their needs, both socially and academically. How could you enhance your communication with parents?

In this session, teachers discussed how they could share what they learned from assessing their deaf students with parents and some challenges they face in this endeavor.

> This year I have tried to write a weekly newsletter giving parents information as to what is happening in the classroom. As the year continues, it does become harder and harder to keep this letter sent every week or every other week. This is a good way to give parents an overview of what is being accomplished in the classroom. However, this method of communication is not enough to really communicate with parents about how their child is doing in specific academic areas.
>
> We need to set up a time schedule for parent-teacher conferences at least twice a year. Parents should also be informed that they have the flexibility to set up appointments with teacher at other times when necessary. Since we only have 12 sixth graders, I think that the schedule could be set so that each parent will receive an adequate amount of time with each homeroom teacher. Sometimes 20 minutes is not enough time to show the student's portfolio and teacher records with each parent.
>
> In the past, I have tried to show parents records and student work during the IEP meetings. Bu[illegible]his was not successful. This information needs to be shared at a separate time, preferably before the IEP meeting. This would give the parent some information relating to what goals are being suggested, and give the teacher an idea of problems that might arise.
>
> This year I have used e-mail as a way to communicate with parents. This is an easy way to inform parents of missing work, low grades, or outstanding achievements that occur within the school day. This is not always a successful method of communication, because not all families have e-mail yet. This year, four out of six of my students do not have e-mail at home.

Reflective Log Question 4.10b: Review the assessments you have completed for your Language/Literacy project. Referring to Fradd and McGee's (1994) Chapter 9, describe how this information guides your instruction.

In this session, teachers read Fradd and McGee's (1994) chapter on using assessment to promote instructional effectiveness. Here are some teachers' responses.

> First of all, this project has guided me in more effective ways of gathering relevant data regarding the current level of functioning for my students. It has helped me look at each child as a whole, and also has helped me focus on the

areas of communication skills, reading skills development, and writing skills development. I have found ways that my students are similar in their strengths and in their needs. I have also found ways that my students differ in their strengths and areas of need. This project has helped me recognize specific areas of need and has "forced" me to search for ways of addressing those needs. It has most definitely led me to more purposeful and effective instruction in all academic areas. Finally, this project has given me many ideas of more effective ways of communicating with the students themselves, with the parents, and with other staff members who are working with my students.

I feel that much of the information I gained through the language/literacy project has been useful in guiding my instruction. Although, our school already had some of the assessments in place (or at least something similar), I find that I am more aware of how differently my students are functioning. I am more aware of their individual needs, and also I am more aware of what their parents feel their needs are. I have gained more background knowledge about my students and am able to apply that knowledge to their learning. I have used my knowledge of their writing levels (through the Kendall writing assessment) to guide how I teach writing and at what level. I, along with four other teachers, have divided our students by writing level, in order to focus on specific needs at each level. I have used my knowledge of my students' independent reading levels to help group stronger and weaker students for shared reading. All of these assessments have guided my instruction in one way or another.

It not only provides information about a student's current level of performance, but also should be used to improve my instruction. Far too often I take results from static assessments and file them away. They do not impact my instruction. Fradd's guidelines made me look at my instructional techniques and if they matched my students' needs.

We need to have more exposure to languages as a factor in learning. We need to ask ourselves how long a student has been living in an environment in which English was the primary language of communication. In the dormitory, we need more English print in the environment. It could be used everyday with a daily agenda and menu. We also can include weekly quotations and daily News. We also need to watch what we are saying in English. We can monitor students' performance to see if they understand our language. We need to view language as a vehicle for achieving goals. We should look at students' performances using a variety of languages, not only English. In the dormitory, we have strong ASL access for communication and some strong academic ASL that helps develop higher level thinking skills.

Reflective Log Question 4.11a: Assess your two students using French's (1999) "Stages of Literacy Development Checklist" (Appendix A) and select one student to focus on for your Language/Literacy project. Write up your Language/Literacy project to be submitted next week.

Teachers chose two students of varying ability levels and conducted a literacy evaluation on them using French's (1999b) literacy checklist. Here is one teacher's description of her student, named "C." The teacher gathered background information about "C" and administered the Kendall Conversational Proficiency Scale, Early Reading Checklist, Early Writing checklist, and Literacy Checklist.

> "C" is a 3.6 year-old boy. He has been involved with the School for the Deaf for about 2 years. "C" and his family initially received home visits from educators in our 0-3 program. Then, in the summer of 2000, "C's" family moved to enable their son to attend a school for the deaf as a day student. "C's" most recent audiograms suggest that his hearing loss is in the moderate-to-severe range unaided. Aided hearing tests show a mild to moderate degree of hearing loss. However, "C" is not a consistent hearing aid user, and these aided responses are often not observed in the classroom setting. In addition, "C" has a condition called delayed myelination. This condition causes "C" to have severe gross and fine motor delays, which is a factor in his ability to communicate. "C's" primary language is ASL. He makes only a few speech sounds and does not communicate either expressively or receptively through spoken English.
>
> "C" lives with his family. His family includes his father, mother, older brother, and twin sister. The primary language used in "C's" home is spoken English. "C's" family does use sign language when communicating with "C." Each person is making a tremendous attempt to learn and use more signs everyday. His parents are also beginning to understand the value of ASL in "C's" life. In addition, they have begun to label various items throughout their home to offer both "C" and their other children more exposure to printed English.
>
> "C" is a very pleasant, well-natured, darling, social, loving little boy. He shows no signs of obstinate behavior in the classroom, and he is always eager to learn. "C's" social interaction and play with his peers are beginning to emerge. He is, however, still content to play alone most of the time. "C's" language levels are also delayed for a child his age. However, he has made great improvements in his language development during this school year. Cognitively, "C" is on target. He is a very bright boy, and is quick to figure things out. "C" definitely has a high potential for learning and a very bright future!

Throughout the year, "C" has been assessed with a variety of the assessment tools provided in French's (1999b) *The Toolkit*. The results from these assessments will be the focus of the remainder of this presentation.

Using French's (1999b) Kendall Conversational Proficiency Levels

"C's" conversational ASL language levels were assessed by his teacher on January 17, 2001. "C's" current P-Level is 2. "C's" strengths follow. "C" often uses language to label objects without cueing. "C" is able to communicate about who owns what and what belongs to whom. "C" is able to link what he says to what others say in some way. "C" is able to use language to identify objects and actions in pictures. "C's" needs follow. "C" needs to use utterances consisting of at least two syntactically related components more often. "C" needs to communicate more about both temporary and more or less permanent characteristics of people and objects. "C" needs to use language to affirm the presence of a substantial number of objects, note their absence, disappearance, or removal, and note their return.

Early Reading Checklist

"C's" reading levels were assessed using French's (1999b) "Early Reading Checklist" on January 17, 2001. "C" consistently demonstrates many of the Emerging Reader characteristics, which is appropriate for his age. "C's" strengths follow. "C" understands the purpose of a book and he will often share a book with others. "C" recognizes all of the capital letters of the alphabet and some lower case letters. "C" sometimes makes simple questions or comments that are relevant to the text. "C's" needs follow. "C" needs to more consistently demonstrate that he knows print information. "C" needs to indicate confusion or lack of understanding with questions, facial expressions, etc. "C" needs to indicate understanding of the sequence of major events when asked.

Using French's (1999b) Kendall Writing Levels

"C's" writing was assessed on February 15, 2001. According to the criteria provided in "Kendall's Writing Levels," "C" writes at Level 1. "C's" strengths in writing follow. "C" enjoys drawing and writing/scribbling. "C" has a strong interest in print and likes attempting to copy letters of the alphabet. "C's" needs follow. "C" needs to develop more gross and fine motor skills before he will be able to perform the mechanics of writing effectively. "C" needs to have a purpose or meaning in mind when he is in the act of drawing and writing/scribbling more often.

Stages of Literacy Development Checklist

"C's" literacy development was assessed on January 17, 2001 using French's (1999b) "Stages of Literacy Development Checklist." "C's" strengths in literacy follow. "C" has a high motivation to read. "C" has an understanding of how books and print work. "C" enjoys watching others perform writing that relates to him. "C" needs to improve his communicative competency to span Levels 2-5 as measured with the "Kendall Conversational Proficiency Levels." "C" needs to make up stories. "C" needs to collaborate with others on writing or drawing projects.

Reflective Log Question 4.12a: Based on your readings, participation in the seminars; and attempts to apply the research, theory, and assessments in your classroom, describe how this project has had an impact on your approach to working with deaf children.

In this last session, teachers discussed how the training had an impact on their teaching of deaf students.

> With regard to the seminars, they were always informative and interactive. I liked the smaller group dynamics and the deaf/hearing mix was very important. In the course of our two years, we lost two deaf members from our group, which seriously shifted the group dynamics. The technology that was presented, the SMARTBoard in particular, was my greatest delight in that I began teaching my class in a whole new way and will continue to do so in a more creative and interactive, not to mention VISUAL, way. All in all, Star Schools has allowed me to examine myself: my own philosophy in education, my teaching methods, and the individual students I teach. As I now plan my lessons and my day, I evaluate how I present each lesson and what method or strategy of interpretation is needed, and if it matches the needs of my students. I also feel more able to assess my students now with the French's *Toolkit*. I'm sure there'll be other assessment tools that I will find useful, but I feel that I have something solid to begin with next fall. I also now feel a stronger need to be more involved with the parents of my students. Star School leaves me challenging myself and my teaching practices on a daily basis.

> I learned a lot from reading and group discussion during my two years. I am an elementary dean of the dormitory; I could apply some good ideas for the dormitory part (home environment).... This star school project needs to have an impact school wide, and I feel that would be us to come out and share our ideas.... It needs to be a school wide program for all of us.

> This project had a definite impact on my approach to working with deaf children. The biggest impact had to do with the realization of what bilingualism is and how it can be applied in the classroom. I am looking at finding more ways to expose my students to meaningful English as a result of this training. I also am looking at each student more as an individual, especially in regard to their base language and how to build a stronger foundation in that base language prior to learning a second language. I learned that ASL is not always the most accessible language for all children at our school. Spoken English is actually more accessible for a few students. That made me realize that one approach only is not always right for all students. I learned how long it takes to acquire a second language, which made me more patient with the progress of my students. One of my favorite theories was that of the Zone of Proximal Development. I always try to keep

that in mind as I prepare lessons for the class - trying to stretch my students' zone as much as possible. The seminars reinforced the concept that learning a language is a complex process that can't be accomplished in one class period per day. I have tried to apply some of the theories across the curriculum in my Science and Math classes.

The past two years with Star Schools has had an amazing impact on my philosophy of education and how I approach lesson planning with my students. Most of my professional growth has occurred within Levels III and IV, as most of the application of what we have learned takes place during the last year of Star Schools. I have enjoyed the group of participants that have gone through this program with me, and it has been very interesting to see the different perspectives we bring to our weekly seminars.

Most importantly, I have learned how to incorporate both English and ASL into the classroom in various ways. Star Schools has taught me how to be more aware of designing lessons that have an equal balance of English and ASL, and that has truly strengthened my teaching skills. In college, the professors mostly discussed the use of good ASL in the classroom, and they often ignored the need to incorporate English as well. Star Schools has provided me with different strategies I can use to incorporate English in meaningful ways for our students.

Reflective Log Question 4.12b: List the strengths of this project and areas that need improvement.

Teachers commented on the strengths and areas that could be improved in the Star Schools training.

The strengths of this project are countless! It was well-organized from the top, and the Reflective Logs gave us opportunities to explore our teaching philosophy in various domains. I love the technology that was incorporated throughout this year, and I am thankful for the experiences with various tools that I was allowed as a Star Schools participant. The people I worked with were awesome, and I truly did benefit from their feedback and input.

This program could have been even more effective if we were able to collaborate with various schools for the deaf and see what they were doing. Just imagine if we could have gotten together for videoconferences or something of that nature! What a great way to see what's going on in other schools for the deaf! After discussing this with my third grade partner, I agree with her in that it would be more productive if the Level IV PowerPoint language/literacy projects focused more on the development of unit lesson plans than assessment of one particular child. Our research would have a greater impact on multiple learners if we were able to focus our energy and our efforts elsewhere. In all, I will not take anything negative with me from this experience. I have learned a lot about my students, myself, how great teaching is supposed to be, and how to collaborate better with those in our field. It

was a wonderful opportunity, and I am forever grateful for those who convinced me to join Star Schools and those who supported me throughout the project.

Summary of Level 4 Training

The issues surrounding assessing the deaf bilingual student are complex. In Level 4, using existing checklists, rating scales, surveys, and teacher-constructed case studies of students; teachers attempted to carry out fair, equitable, and useful assessment of their deaf bilingual students. This level was the final one in the four levels of Star Schools training. Teachers spent two years discussing theories and methodology of bilingualism, first and second language acquisition, literacy development, classroom strategies and techniques to increase literacy, and assessment tools and issues. The teachers applied many of these concepts and methods to their teaching of deaf children. The deaf child came to be viewed as having two languages—ASL and English. The teachers' major challenge was to provide their students with many opportunities to acquire and develop language proficiency in both languages.

Teachers' Use of Technology

Another goal of the Star Schools project was to increase the use of technology in the deaf bilingual classroom. Technology such as digital cameras, digital camcorders, PowerPoint presentations with LCD projectors, CD-ROM software, Internet, and SMARTBoards can play an important role in assisting the teacher, not only in providing visuals and graphics, but also in demonstrating the two languages—ASL and English.

In 1997, when the project began, there was very little use of technology among the five participating schools. By the end of Year 4, we have observed an increase in the use of technology. In addition, teachers have shared their concerns with us. Although they saw

technology demonstrated very often by the mentors in the weekly seminars, teachers felt they were still in need of support and training to utilize technology on a daily basis in their classrooms.

To address this need, in February of 2001, Jill Naumann, the Star Schools Technology Specialist, facilitated a technology training session for mentors. During this time, mentors from the five participating schools came to NMSD and received training in the use of SMARTBoards, LCDs, PowerPoint, digital camcorders, and digital cameras. In Year 4, mentors and teachers were asked to track, as accurately as possible, the frequency of technology applications and we collected considerable data describing approximate frequencies of technology use throughout the year. Teachers also contributed information on "Classroom Technology Use" forms describing in detail how they used technology or software programs within a lesson. Most of the classroom technology applications were reported to have successful results with students. One problematic factor reported by some teachers was that some technology required a large amount of time to set up before the lesson. Despite this minor problem reported on a few occasions, teachers not only used technology creatively, they also noted many benefits of incorporating technology into their lessons.

In a tally of the frequency of technology use during Year 4 of the project, we can provide the following figures with a fairly good margin of accuracy. We also note that many teachers reported they used their TTYs, computers, Internet, email, and word processing programs (WORD, Word Perfect) on a daily basis. Some teachers also used scanners and education software such as Inspirations and Corel Presentations very frequently throughout the week.

Throughout the year (approximately 25 weeks of training), 36 Star Schools participants reported using the following:

- Digital camera: frequency count: 50
- Digital camcorder: frequency count: 110
- SMARTBoard: frequency count: 150
- PowerPoint/LCD: frequency count: 120
- TV/VCR: frequency count: 60
- Other: (computer/Internet/email, videodisk, scanner, educational software, CD software): frequency count: 300

Star Schools teachers across all grade levels were using technology on a regular basis. Many commented that the visuals provided by technology helped in explaining English print to deaf students. Students of all ages enjoyed using the photos from a digital camera in the creation of written stories, a digital camcorder in the making of movies, and PowerPoint software in the preparation of presentations. Teachers of young deaf children frequently took digital photos to send home to parents so the students could have conversations with their parents about their daily class activities and used digital cameras to take action pictures for children to label. Teachers also had students write letters home based on digital photos taken during the week.

Some teachers mentioned that their students used computers daily for word processing. Literacy learning was enhanced by students searching the Internet for information and creating their own PowerPoint presentations. Some students created presentations using software to add visuals and graphics. Their signed presentations were supported by their own written English in their PowerPoint presentations.

Students were able to use classroom technologies in a variety of activities. One class used technology to videoconference with a panel of veterans who had served their country. They interviewed the veterans via an interpreter. Other classroom activities included

writing newsletters, using digital cameras, utilizing Adobe Photoshop to create effects on their digital photos, and making a videotape based on a story read in class. (In this activity, the students wrote the script, enacted the story, and shot and produced the video after reading the text.)

With older students, teachers videotaped students presenting ASL monologues, and the students reviewed the videotape for self-evaluation purpose. A speech teacher reported using visual phonics software. A science teacher used the "Star Child" Internet site to teach about the solar system. Other science teachers downloaded pictures from the Internet for science lessons. Photos taken with digital cameras were used often for follow-up activities after field trips. Teachers of younger students made activity books with digital photos showing students at school or at home, displaying the words and signs to describe the pictures. In addition, many teachers reported the use of a variety of instructional software.[5]

How Technology Enhances ASL/English Bilingual Classrooms

From our teachers' experiments with classroom technology, we have observed that technology contributes in a variety of ways to the language learning process. ASL, a visual/gestural language, can be easily captured in digital movies and videotapes and played back for students to view, discuss, and analyze. English can be displayed visually as it is modeled and demonstrated on computer screens, in PowerPoint presentations on SMARTBoards, or on conventional screens.

[5] Hyper studio, CDROM encyclopedias, "I Spy," Claris works, Abkey, Dot to Dot, Fun Fair, Jigsaw Puzzle, KidPix 2, Kid Works, Kids Math 2.1, Match it, Math Blaster, Number Munchers, Turbo Math Fact, Spellbound, Inspirations SoftwareSoftware: Microsoft Word, Adobe Photoshop, Adobe PageMaker, Apple works 6, Fisher Price Toddler, Group wise, KIDS Logical Journey, Reading Blaster, 100 great kids' games, Encarta 95, Zurk's learning safari, spellbound, Freddie Fish, Franklin learns math, SMARTBoard file, Signlink.

Technology can help teachers organize presentations and lessons, while helping deaf students become more engaged in the learning process. From our examination of teachers' classroom technology use reports, we noted many advantages of technology use in classrooms with deaf learners. We outline more advantages of classroom technology below.

1. To promote organization of information in any kind of classroom presentation (e.g., visuals with captions, graphic organizers, slide shows, PowerPoint presentations), both for teachers (in the delivery of information) and students (in the reception or delivery of information).
2. To help a teacher allocate and separate the two languages (ASL and English) in the classroom and direct the language activity more effectively (e.g., signing a lecture, then providing print equivalent in a PowerPoint presentation on a SmartBoard).
3. To help teachers organize overall lessons and activities more effectively, with goals for learning more clearly articulated.
4. To help teachers facilitate classroom review (e.g., printed summaries in a PowerPoint presentation, a signed summary on a videotape).
5. To promote better student retention.
6. To create an effective learner-centered classroom environment.
7. To contribute to students' empowerment and self-esteem by showing respect for ASL and English used in the classroom.

We describe the use of specific technologies in detail below.

The SMARTBoard is an extremely effective technology tool for deaf bilingual classrooms. There are a variety of ways the SMARTBoard can be used. This technology allows students to see both (whole) written text and a range of visuals at any given time during the lesson. The teacher can control when and how to introduce text or visual information as she perceives it is needed. Deaf students often become more engaged in the learning process because of the visual advantages the equipment offers. Students can use the equipment themselves as well, giving them a greater sense of empowerment and self-direction in the classroom.

PowerPoint (plus the SMARTBoard) makes classroom presentations clear and organized. Incorporating into lessons such visuals as graphics, photographs, and animation is

easy and helps students comprehend the content. Utilizing PowerPoint, teachers report that their presentations are more interesting, attractive, and appealing. Consequently, students likely have better retention when information is presented with the aid of PowerPoint. Teachers describe a kind of flow in the learning process, or as one teacher described it, "students learn without realizing they are learning."

Digital cameras and digital camcorders appear to be extremely valuable in classrooms with deaf students. Especially for young children and students in the earlier stages of developing language, a picture truly is "worth a thousand words." For deaf students, this is really powerful. Children can view themselves participating in activities throughout the day. They can recall their experiences and use the digital photos in follow-up activities (e.g., labeling the photo, using ASL or English to describe or discuss what the photo is about). Photos can serve as a point of reference for topics and can support language development and other communication activities. Digital camcorders have also been used for students to watch themselves signing. This kind of activity can help build self-awareness and self-esteem and can support self-critique in the language development process.

These are only a few examples of the advantages and benefits we have observed from incorporating a variety of technology tools in classrooms with deaf bilingual learners. We have only touched the surface and anticipate more teacher exploration.

Final Note on the Impact of the Star Schools Project

In this Year 4 report, we document the curriculum, training materials, readings, reflective log questions, and teachers' responses to the reflective log questions as part of Levels 3 and 4 focusing on bilingual methodology and assessment issues (see Appendices C and D). In Year 5, we plan to conduct inservices of Levels 1 and 2, as well as Levels 3 and

4 at a total of eight schools. We plan to use Everett Rogers (1983) model of "Diffusion of Innovations" in order to further understand how the innovation of the "ASL/English Bilingual Staff Development Model" was accepted and used by the schools. We will employ an outside evaluator who has not been involved in the project to measure the "Levels of Use" of the innovation and "Levels of Concern" of the innovation throughout the five schools. We hope to further develop and expand this professional development model at the end of the final year of our project (2001-02).

The Star Schools Project has impacted dozens of teachers in nine schools for the deaf throughout the U.S. It has enabled teachers to consider or rethink how they view the deaf student as a bilingual language learner. This project has generated a new project—"Star Online." Within the "Star Online" Project, the inservice curriculum developed for the nine residential schools is being modified for a new audience—preservice teachers in university teacher-training programs in deaf education. Over a five-year time period, 12 universities will experiment with Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 that will have been modified for preservice teachers in university teacher education programs. Thus, the next generation of teachers will have access to the ASL/English Bilingual training.

Another impact of the Star Schools project is the establishment of the Center for ASL/English Bilingual Education and Research (CAEBER) at the New Mexico School for the Deaf. Under the leadership of Dr. Stephen M. Nover and Superintendent Ron Stern of NMSD, this center was established to develop research, analyze outcomes, and create educational products in ASL/English bilingual methodology in deaf education. In addition to its USDLC projects (the Star Schools project impacts 9 schools and Star Online impacts 12 university teacher preparation programs), CAEBER provides support and consultation on

using ASL/English bilingual methodologies to two large Texas technology projects housed at Lamar University: "Project INVEST" (2001-2003) and "Project Homework Helper" (2001-2003).

The CAEBER staff also works collaboratively with Drs. Cindy Bailes and Carol Erting at Gallaudet University on a research project entitled "Signs of Literacy: Becoming Bilingual Teachers through Star Schools Training." This research, funded by Gallaudet University, will investigate how teachers participating in the ASL/English bilingual staff development changed in their language beliefs, language use, teaching practices, and classroom interactions over time, both collectively and individually. The results of this research, in concert with the Star Schools studies, will impact the Clerc Center's National Mission efforts—to improve the ASL and English of deaf children throughout the nation.

At the New Mexico School for the Deaf, the CAEBER staff members also provide support to an integrated first-grade classroom, enrolling both hearing and deaf children, where students are taught using the two languages—ASL and English. Researchers from San Diego State University are involved in monthly assessments of these students as they grow in language proficiency using the two languages.

In summary, the Star Schools Project, by its fourth year, has had an impact in some unexpected and serendipitous ways:

1. How teachers' beliefs were changed as they read about, reflected, wrote about, and discussed bilingual methodology, first and second language acquisition, and language and literacy approaches
2. How teachers teach language at nine residential schools for the deaf across the country

3. The establishment of an Advisory Board to the Star Online Project providing interaction and collaboration regarding coursework in ASL/English bilingual methodology among professors from 12 university teacher-training programs

4. The establishment of a Center for ASL/English Bilingual Education and Research (CAEBER) at the New Mexico School for the Deaf

5. New, joint education and research projects at universities in Texas, California, and Washington, DC

Appendix A

Star Schools Project
A Conceptual Framework for Deaf Education:
Bilingual/ESL Approaches to English Literacy

Syllabus
Level 1

Teacher Development: An Overview

The Star Schools two-year teacher development plan provides an opportunity for teachers to use critical pedagogy as defined by Wink (2000). Critical pedagogy is a process whereby teachers "name" their beliefs, "reflect" critically on them, and then take "action." Teachers in the Star Schools training will "name" traditional beliefs, critically and collaboratively "reflect" on them, and then "act" to implement effective practices of bilingual/ESL instruction that will enhance the achievement of deaf students in all academic classes. The overall focus will be on two components of bilingual instruction: (1) a bilingual approach that involves the use of ASL and English and (2) an ESL approach that involves the exclusive use of English as a second language. ASL consists of two language skills: attending and signing. English consists of eight language skills: reading, writing, speaking, listening, fingerreading, fingerspelling, lipreading, and typing.

Seminar Description: Levels 1-2

During the first year, teachers participate in 24 seminars (two hours each) totaling 48 hours of training; the initial and final seminars of each semester are used for orientation/review and evaluation. During the first year, participants review the current research on bilingual/ESL education, culture, the deaf bilingual child, first and second language acquisition and learning, language use, language teaching, and language assessment. Teachers reflect on the concepts of bilingualism presented and observe how they apply to their own classrooms. The result is a collection of teachers' stories that describe teacher development in creating a bilingual classroom for deaf children.

Seminar Requirements

1. **Attendance**: Teachers attend 12 seminars (two hours each) per semester; the first is for orientation and the last for evaluation. Attendance is mandatory because participation in and contributions to the seminars are essential; teachers who miss more than two seminars are subject to losing their stipend ($1,000 each semester).
2. **Communication**: Teachers are expected to use ASL during seminar meetings.
3. **Reflective Log Assignments (RLA):** Teachers are expected to complete the reading assignments and type reflective log assignments before weekly seminars, share individual responses, and participate in weekly reflective activities.
   - Reflective log questions are completed for 10 seminars each semester; these logs express an individual's response to the readings, topics discussed in seminars, and/or experiences that teachers have had in their classrooms. Log entries are used as a basis for group discussion, serve as a written record of individuals' thinking, and provide data for research purposes and dissemination of successful strategies of language teaching.
   - Teachers are expected to keep all completed reflective log assignments throughout the year for documentation of professional development.

- It is critical that reflective log assignments be turned in on time for effective participation and for research purposes.

4. **Videotaping:** One 15 to 20-minute videotape by each teacher is required. These videotapes are utilized for a variety of functions to fulfill the requirements of the Star Schools project. For Level 1, teachers videotape one of their lessons using one or more of Freeman and Freeman's (1998) *Seven Principles for Effective Language Learning*. Teachers can use these videotapes for self-assessment, paired viewing for peer coaching, and/or for demonstrations/presentations to professional peers.

Required Texts

- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Parasnis, I. (Ed.). (1996). *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Required Articles

- Hansen, B. (1994). Trends in the progress toward bilingual education for deaf children in Denmark. In C. Erting, R. Johnson, D. Smith, & B. Snider (Eds.), *The Deaf way: Perspectives from the International Conference on Deaf Culture* (pp. 605-614). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- McLaughlin, B. (1995). *Fostering second language development in young children: Principles and practices* (Educational Practice Report No. 14). Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 932)
- Nover, S., Christensen, K., & Cheng, L. (1998). Development of ASL and English competence for learners who are deaf. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18*(4), 61-72.
- Nover, S., & Moll, L. (1997). Cultural mediation of deaf cognition. In M. P. Moeller & B. Shick (Eds.), *Deafness and diversity: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 39-50). Omaha, NE: Boys Town National Research Hospital.

Recommended Text

- Knight, P., & Swanwick, R. (1999). *The care and education of a deaf child*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Level 1 of the Star Schools Training

ORIENTATION

Key Topic(s)

1. Distribute all books and notebooks for Level 1
2. Establish communication expectations
3. Introduce Star Schools' vision and mission statement
4. Distribute and discuss contracts/syllabus
5. Discuss seminar protocol
6. Assignments for Seminar 1.1
7. Preview of Seminar 1.1

SEMINAR 1.1

Theme: Deaf Learners are Bilingual and Bicultural

Key Topic(s):

- Overview of bilingualism and biculturalism

Reading Assignment Due

- Grosjean, F. (1998). Living with two languages and cultures. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Culture and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 20-37). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

Reflect upon the chapter you have read, and share your thoughts and feelings on the following concepts:

1. Reflect upon and discuss how you view yourself as a deaf or hearing person who is bilingual and bicultural.
2. Reflect upon and discuss how you view your students and your school as bilingual and bicultural.

SEMINAR 1.2

Theme: The Paradigm Shift to Viewing Deaf Learners as Bilinguals

Key Topic(s)

- Historical and cultural aspects of bilingualism in deaf education

Reading Assignment Due

- Hakuta, K., & Mostafapour, E. (1998). Perspectives from the history and the politics of bilingualism and bilingual education in the United States. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Culture and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 38-50). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, B. (1994). Trends in the progress toward bilingual education for deaf children in Denmark. In C. Erting, R. Johnson, D. Smith, & B. Snider (Eds.), *The Deaf way: Perspectives from the International Conference on Deaf Culture*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Reflect upon and discuss the changes in deaf education since you first became a part of the system as a student and/or teacher.
2. Reflect upon and discuss the influences of the medical/pathological model on your deaf education training and teaching practice.

SEMINAR 1.3

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn through Second Language Instruction

Key Topic(s)

- Second language instruction
- ESL/EFL approaches
- Orientations and methods

Reading Assignment Due

- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Introduction. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. xiii-xix). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Contexts and orientations. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 1-29). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Reflect upon and discuss the differences in the amounts of exposure to English within ESL and EFL settings, and compare the experiences of hearing students in these settings to the experiences of deaf students.
2. Review the five orientations identified in the readings, and reflect upon and describe which orientations of second language instruction you have used with deaf students. Include your reasons for using them.

SEMINAR 1.4

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn Language through Content

Key Topic(s)

- Deaf bilinguals learn language through content

Reading Assignment Due

- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Teaching language through content. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 30-61). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Reflect upon one of your lessons based on a grammar approach and another lesson based on a content approach. What were the strengths and weaknesses of each approach?
2. Reflect upon Freeman and Freeman's Chapter 2. How might you change your teaching approach or plan your lessons differently?

SEMINAR 1.5

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn from Whole to Part Instruction

Key Topic(s)

- Whole to part instruction
- Conversational (BICS) language and academic (CALP) language
- Cummins' quadrant

Reading Assignment Due

- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Learning goes from whole to part. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 62-87). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Reflect upon Cummins' emphasis (as discussed in Freeman and Freeman) on the importance of learners developing two types of language proficiency: social (BICS) and academic (CALP) and that the contextual support differs for each of these. Discuss how this concept might apply to deaf children who are acquiring both ASL and English.
2. Reflect upon "Preview, View, Review" (Freeman & Freeman, 1998, pp. 77-78) as an example of whole to part teaching. Develop and describe an activity for your classroom using this approach.

SEMINAR 1.6

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn through Learner-Centered and Meaningful Experiences

Key Topic(s)

- Learner-centered and meaningful lessons

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Lessons should be learner centered. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 88-125). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- ❑ Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Lessons should have meaning and purpose for learners now. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 126-147). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Students learn as they engage in activities in which they find meaning, set purpose, claim ownership, and take risks. Reflect on a learner-centered and meaningful lesson(s) that you have used, and describe the success of that experience(s).
2. Develop and describe a lesson that is learner-centered and meaningful.

SEMINAR 1.7

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn Language through Social Interaction

Key Topic(s)

- ❑ Interactive settings to facilitate language acquisition and learning

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Learning takes place in social interaction. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 148-175). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- ❑ McLaughlin, B. (1995). *Fostering second language development in young children: Principles and Practices* (Educational Practice Report No. 14). Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 932)

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Reflect upon the traditional practice of deaf children having to learn English with a focus on form (grammar and vocabulary). How might we increase deaf children's opportunities to use English in an interactive setting (in the dorm, at home, etc.)?
2. Select several principles McLaughlin (1995) has identified to foster second language acquisition. How might you apply those principles to your instructional practice?

SEMINAR 1.8

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn and Use Language through a Variety of Modes

Key Topic(s)

- ❑ Modes in language use

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Lessons should include all four modes. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 176-191). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- ❑ Nover et al (1998). Development of ASL and English competence for learners who are deaf. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18*(4), 61-72.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Using Table 3 as a guide (Nover et al., 1998, p. 68), develop and describe activities that enhance language abilities using (a) a bilingual approach (10 language skills) and (b) an ESL approach (8 language skills).
2. Using the attached form, analyze language use in five of your classroom activities. Briefly describe each student activity using each modality: signacy, literacy, and oracy.

SEMINAR 1.9
Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn when Lessons Support their First Language and Culture

Key Topic(s)
- Support of students' first languages and cultures

Reading Assignment Due
- Emerton, R. G. (1998). Marginality, biculturalism, and social identity of deaf people. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp.136-145). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Lessons should support students' first languages and cultures, Part one. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 192-218). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. Respond to an audience of your choice (parents, teachers, administrators, community), and identify three major points you would use to justify the importance of supporting the first language and culture of deaf children.
2. Develop and describe activities for your class that promote cultural/linguistic self-awareness, self-esteem, and empowerment for deaf students within a bilingual setting.

SEMINAR 1.10
Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn Language in a Variety of Bilingual Education Programs and Models

Key Topic(s)
- Types of bilingual programs and models

Reading Assignment Due
- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Lessons should support students' first languages and cultures, Part two. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 219-240). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Solîs, A. (2001 April). Boosting our understanding of bilingual education: A refresher on philosophy and models. *IDRA Newsletter, XXVIII (4)*, 3-6.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. Identify a successful deaf learner from your current or previous teaching experience. Reflect upon and discuss the factors you believe contributed to his/her success (educational program, family, environment, interest in reading, etc.).
2. Reflect upon and develop a program for your school that promotes successful deaf learners in a bilingual setting.

SEMINAR 1.11
Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn When Educators Have Faith in Them

Key Topic(s)
- Faith in the learner
- Attitudes toward deaf English language learners

Reading Assignment Due

- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Faith in the learner expands student potential. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 241-266). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

"Stories of students have convinced us that of all the seven principles for success, the 'faith in the learner' principle is the most critical. When teachers show they believe in their students, the other principles follow naturally" (Freeman & Freeman, 1998, p. 246).

1. Reflect upon the above quote and describe some instructional experiences in which your expectations toward students have influenced their performance positively or negatively.
2. Reflect upon how to promote high expectations of deaf students. How can your school help students become independent and resourceful learners in all areas of the curriculum?

SEMINAR 1.12

Themes:

- Deaf Bilinguals Learn When Educators Apply Bilingual Teaching Principles for Effective Language Learning

Key Topic(s)

- Application of Freeman and Freeman's (1998) bilingual teaching principles
- Reflection and evaluation

Reading Assignment Due

- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). Epilogue. *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success* (pp. 267-275). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Nover, S., & Moll, L. (1997). Cultural mediation of deaf cognition. In M. P. Moeller & B. Shick (Eds.), *Deafness and diversity: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 39-50). Omaha, NE: Boys Town National Research Hospital.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Reflect upon the language experiences of a bilingual student whose instructor uses the *Seven Principles for Effective Language Learning* (as discussed by Freeman & Freeman, 1998). Compare the experiences of this student to Nover's (Nover and Moll, 1997) language learning experience.
2. During the seminar, be prepared to provide feedback on these topics:
    - Impact of Level 1 on your thoughts and/or teaching
    - Strengths of the project
    - Areas for project improvement
    - Areas for seminar improvement
    - Types of engaged learning techniques you have tried

Appendix B

Star Schools Project
A Conceptual Framework for Deaf Education:
Bilingual/ESL Approaches to English Literacy

Syllabus
Level 2

Teacher Development: An Overview

The Star Schools two-year teacher development plan provides an opportunity for teachers to use critical pedagogy as defined by Wink (2000). Critical pedagogy is a process whereby teachers "name" their beliefs, "reflect" critically on them, and then take "action." Teachers in the Star Schools training will "name" traditional beliefs, critically and collaboratively "reflect" on them, and then "act" to implement effective practices of bilingual/ESL instruction that will enhance the achievement of deaf students in all academic classes. The overall focus will be on two components of bilingual instruction: (1) a bilingual approach that involves the use of ASL and English and (2) an ESL approach that involves the exclusive use of English as a second language. ASL consists of two language skills: attending and signing. English consists of eight language skills: reading, writing, speaking, listening, fingerreading, fingerspelling, lipreading, and typing.

Seminar Description: Levels 1-2

During the first year, teachers participate in 24 seminars (two hours each) totaling 48 hours of training; the initial and final seminar of each semester is used for orientation/review and evaluation. The first year reviews the current research on bilingual/ESL education, culture, the deaf bilingual child, first and second language acquisition and learning, language use, language teaching, and language assessment. Teachers reflect on the concepts of bilingualism presented and observe how they apply to their own classrooms. The result is a collection of teachers' stories that describe teacher development in creating a bilingual classroom for deaf children.

Seminar Requirements

1. **Attendance**: Teachers attend 12 seminars (two hours each) per semester; the first is for orientation and the last for evaluation. Attendance is mandatory because participation in and contributions to the seminars are essential; teachers who miss more than two seminars are subject to losing their stipend ($1,000 each semester).
2. **Communication**: Teachers are expected to use ASL during seminar meetings.
3. **Reflective Log Assignments (RLA):** Teachers are expected to complete the reading assignments and type reflective log assignments before weekly seminars, share individual responses, and participate in weekly reflective activities.
   - Reflective log assignments are completed for 12 seminars each semester; these logs will express individual's response to the readings, topics discussed in seminars, and/or experiences that teachers have had in their classrooms. Log entries are used as a basis for group discussion, serve as a written record of an individual's thinking, and provide data for research purposes and dissemination of successful strategies of language teaching
   - Teachers are expected to keep all completed reflective log assignments throughout the year for documentation of professional development.
   - It is critical that reflective log assignments be turned in on time for effective participation and for research purposes.
4. **Videotaping:** One 15 to 20-minute videotape by each teacher is required. These videotapes are utilized for a variety of functions in order to fulfill the requirements of the Star Schools project. For Level Two, teachers can videotape a lesson where students are using either ASL or English in both social and academic activities. Teachers can use these videotapes for self-assessment, paired viewing for peer coaching, and/or for demonstrations/presentations to professional peers.

Required Texts

- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Parasnis, I. (Ed.). (1996). *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Required Articles

- Graney, S. (1997). Where does speech fit in?: Spoken English in a bilingual context. Working Paper, Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Pre-College National Mission Programs.
- Grosjean, E. (2000 Winter). The right of the deaf child to grow up bilingual (pp. 27-31). *The Endeavor*: American Society for Deaf Children.
- Jacobson, R. (1990). Allocating the two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Mahshie, S. (1997). *A first language: Whose choice is it?* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Pre-College National Mission Programs.
- Nover, S. (1995). Politics and language: American Sign Language and English in deaf education. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics in deaf communities* (pp. 109-163). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Padden, C., & Ramsey, C. (1998). Reading ability in signing deaf children. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18(4),* 30-46.
- Pickersgill, M. (1998). Bilingualism- Current policy and practice. In S. Gregory, P. Knight, W. McCracken, S. Powers, & L. Watson (Eds.), *Issues in deaf education* (pp. 89-97). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosen, S., & Virnig, S. (1997, May). *A synopsis of the Bill of Rights for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children* [WWW document]. URL http://nad.policy.net/proactive/newsroom/release.vtml?id=17960.
- Mather, S. M., & Mitchell, R. (1993). Communication abuse: A sociolinguistic perspective. In B. Snider (Ed.), *Conference proceedings: Post Milan ASL & English literacy: Issues, trends, & research* (pp. 117-134). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, College of Continuing Education.
- Strong, M. (1995). A review of bilingual/bicultural programs for deaf children in North America. *American Annals of the Deaf, 140* (2), 84-90.
- Wink, J. (2000). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world (p. 54-55).* New York: Longman.

Recommended Articles/Texts

- Bruton, H., & Raimondo, B. (1999). *Can teaching ASL be construed as "child abuse?"* [WWW document]. URL http://www.deafcarolina.com.
- Knight, P., & Swanwick, R. (1999). *The care and education of a deaf child*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Muhlke, M. (2000 Winter). The right to language and linguistic development: Deafness from a human rights perspective. *Virginia Journal of International Law, 40*, 705- 760.

Level 2 of the Star Schools Training

SEMINAR 2.1

Theme: Deaf Learners Have the Right to Bilingual Education

Key Topic(s)

- Definitions and distinctions of bilingualism
- Deaf child's right to bilingual education

Reading Assignment Due

- Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 1: Bilingualism: Definitions and distinctions. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 2-16). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Grosjean, E. (Winter, 2000). The right of the deaf child to grow up bilingual. *The Endeavor* (pp. 28-31). American Society for Deaf Children.
- Mahshie, S. (1997). *A first language: Whose choice is it?* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Pre-College National Mission Programs.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Use examples you have observed in your own deaf English language learners to illustrate the differences between *language ability* and *language use*.
2. Discuss your thoughts, feelings and reactions to Grosjean's (2000) article.
3. Discuss three or four issues from Mashie's (1997) article that had an impact on you.

SEMINAR 2.2

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn When their Languages and Cultures are Valued

Key Topic(s)

- Definitions and distinctions of biculturalism
- Living and learning in a bilingual/bicultural environment

Reading Assignment Due

- Finton, L. (1998). Living in a bilingual-bicultural family. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 258-271). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Padden, C.A. (1998). From the cultural to the bicultural: The modern deaf community. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 79-98). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Present two case studies of your students with diverse cultural needs. Describe how these students have experienced culture at home, school, or in social settings. How do you make cultural choices in the classroom to match student needs (e.g., Latino, African-American, Native American, or Asian backgrounds)?
2. Discuss how you can incorporate Deaf culture in your educational setting.

SEMINAR 2.3

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn When ASL is Viewed as a Language Resource

Key Topic(s)

- Politics of bilingualism
- Language orientations

Reading Assignment Due

- Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 18: Bilingualism: The politics of bilingualism. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 366-400). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Wink, J. (2000). The hidden curriculum. *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world* (pp. 54-55). New York: Longman.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. What are your personal experiences with the three language orientations, and how do these experiences affect your students?
2. Reflect upon and describe some of your personal experiences and/or observations with the written and unwritten language policies and practices found in your school.

SEMINAR 2.4
Theme: Deaf Bilingual Learners can be Affected by the Politics of Bilingualism in Deaf Education

Key Topic(s)
- Audism and hearization
- Multiculturalism and racism

Reading Assignment Due
- Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 19: Multiculturalism and anti-racism. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 401-415). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Nover, S. (1995). Politics and language: American Sign Language and English in deaf education. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics in deaf communities* (pp. 109-163). Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.
- Rosen, S., & Virnig, S. (1997, May). *A synopsis of the Bill of Rights for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children* [WWW document]. URL http://nad.policy.net/proactive/newsroom/release.vtml?id=17960.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. Based upon your personal experiences and/or observations at your school, discuss and reflect on the parallels between audism/hearization and racism/assimilation. How can you address and/or resolve these issues within your school community (staff, faculty, administration, parents)?
2. Reflect on your personal experiences with the concept of the hidden curriculum as it relates to racism, sexism, audism, and other examples of social justice. Reflect on examples of each that you have experienced or observed within your environment.

SEMINAR 2.5
Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn through a Variety of Bilingual Education Programs

Key Topic(s)
- Varieties of bilingual education programs
- Strong and weak forms of bilingual education

Reading Assignment Due
- Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 9: An introduction to bilingual education. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 181-202). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Strong, M. (1995). A review of bilingual/bicultural programs for deaf children in North America. *American Annals of the Deaf, 140(2),* 84-90.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. Based on the readings, describe in detail one of the types of bilingual education with which you are most familiar. Reflect upon and discuss what you think are the important characteristics of that form of a bilingual education program.
2. What are the strong and weak points of your school/department's bilingual program? How can we address the weakest points?

SEMINAR 2.6
Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Have Diverse Language Needs

Key Topic(s)
- Educational and language choices in deaf education
- Role of speech and audiology in bilingual placements

Reading Assignment Due

- Graney, S. (1997). *Where does speech fit in?: Spoken English in a bilingual context.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Pre-College National Mission Programs.
- Pickersgill, M. (1998). Bilingualism- Current policy and practice. In S. Gregory, P. Knight, W. McCracken, S. Powers, & L. Watson (Eds.), *Issues in deaf education* (pp. 89-97). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Reflect upon the range of communication situations a deaf child is likely to encounter. Discuss how you prepare a child to communicate successfully in these various situations.
2. Present two case studies of your students with diverse language needs. Describe how they use languages at home, school, or in social settings. How do you make language choices in the classroom to match their language needs?

SEMINAR 2.7

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Develop Bilingualism through Different Routes

Key Topic(s)

- Development of bilingualism
- Simultaneous and sequential acquisition of bilingualism
- Codeswitching

Reading Assignment Due

- Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 5: The development of bilingualism. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 85-108). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Create a case study of a student's route to bilingualism considering the following factors: (a) what was the student's exposure to formal and informal languages (ASL and English) in his/her home, community, and school environment? (b) Has he/she experienced simultaneous or sequential exposure to ASL and English? How can your instruction and classroom environment enhance the student's individual language experience?
2. Refer to Baker's (2001) "12 Purposes of Codeswitching" (pp. 102-104), and describe the following: a) a specific activity in which you used codeswitching in your setting; b) a specific activity in which you observed a student codeswitching.

SEMINAR 2.8

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Develop Bridges Between Their Two Languages

Key Topic(s)

- Bridges between ASL and English
- Sign systems and the role of fingerspelling

Reading Assignment Due

- Padden, C. (1998). Early bilingual lives of deaf children. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 99-116). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Padden, C., & Ramsey, C. (1998). Reading ability in signing deaf children. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18(4)*, 30-46.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

Through guided practice in the use of fingerspelling and fingerreading in the classroom, students' literacy development can be promoted. The following instructional techniques, *chaining* and *sandwiching* (Padden & Ramsey, 1998), use signing, fingerspelling, and fingerreading to support literacy development.

1. Describe an activity in which you used *sandwiching* or *chaining* to facilitate English literacy development in your classroom. How have these methods helped your students understand the relationships between fingerspelling, fingerreading, signs, and printed words?
2. Discuss the role of other fingerspelling techniques in your instructional setting. Explain why fingerspelling is important and when it should be used.

SEMINAR 2.9

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn through Cognitively Demanding Language Lessons in ASL and English

Key Topic(s)

- ❑ Cognitive and language development of bilingual children
- ❑ Cognitive theories of bilingualism and the curriculum

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 8: Cognitive theories of bilingualism and the curriculum. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 162-180). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- ❑ Hamers, J. (1998). Cognitive and language development of bilingual children. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 51-75). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Describe a variety of teaching strategies you have used for lessons and where they are placed on Cummins' quadrant (Baker, 2001, pp. 176-178). How effectively have you covered the range from cognitively undemanding/context embedded to cognitively demanding/context reduced?
2. Provide a detailed explanation of the aspects of Hamer's (1998) article that made a strong impact on you.

SEMINAR 2.10

Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn from Lessons that Support Development of Bilingualism

Key Topic(s)

- ❑ Theories of second language acquisition and learning
- ❑ Attitudes and motivation: Integrative motivation and instrumental motivation

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 6: Second language acquisition and learning. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 109-133). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Discuss how Baker's (2001) Chapter 6 relates to you and/or a student's experiences of acquiring and learning a second language.
2. Related to Krashen's (as discussed in Baker, 2001) distinction of language acquisition and language learning, complete the attached Language Acquisition and Learning chart and describe classroom activities that support:
    - ASL acquisition
    - English acquisition
    - ASL learning
    - English learning

    Make a transparency of your chart to bring to share at the seminar.

SEMINAR 2.11
Theme: Deaf Bilinguals Learn When Language Use is Planned

Key Topic(s)
- Language teaching approaches
- Allocation of ASL and English

Reading Assignment Due
- Baker, C. (2001). Chapter 13: Language development and language allocation in bilingual education settings. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.) (pp. 268-294). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Jacobson, R. (1990). Allocating the two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. Reflect upon one full school day. List your different subjects/activities. Using the attached Language Distribution Chart, estimate the percentage of time you and the students used ASL and English during the day. Select an activity from the graph. Explain the rationale for the amount of time using ASL and/or English.
2. Discuss the strategic use of two languages (ASL and English) when planning activities for instruction. Consider the separation and allocation of both languages (e.g., when and why you would use ASL storytellling or read the printed text).

SEMINAR 2.12
Theme: Reflection and Evaluation

Key Topic(s)
- Reflection of Level 2 training

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. Based on your readings and participation in the seminars from Level 2, discuss how this experience has influenced your thinking.
2. List the strengths of this project and areas that need improvement.

Appendix C

Star Schools Project
A Conceptual Framework for Deaf Education:
Bilingual/ESL Approaches to English Literacy

Syllabus -- revised 8/31/00
Fall 2000 - Level 3

Teacher Development: An Overview

The Star Schools two-year teacher development plan provides an opportunity for teachers to use critical pedagogy as defined by Wink (2000). Critical pedagogy is a process whereby teachers "name" their beliefs, "reflect" critically on them, and then take "action." Teachers in the Star Schools training "name" traditional beliefs, critically and collaboratively "reflect" on them, and then "act" to implement effective practices of bilingual/ESL instruction that will enhance the achievement of deaf students in all academic classes. The overall focus is on two components of bilingual instruction: (1) a bilingual approach that involves the use of ASL and English and (2) an ESL approach that involves the exclusive use of English as a second language.

Seminar Description: Levels 3-4

In the second year, teachers participate in 24 seminars (2 hours each) totaling 48 hours of training, focusing on teaching language and literacy based on bilingual assessment and bilingual methodology. Teachers, using action research, apply various assessment tools using ASL and English to explore ways of assessing students' language and literacy behaviors. Based on the results of these assessments, bilingual methodology is identified to match the language (ASL and English) and English literacy needs of students.

Seminar Requirements

1. **Attendance**: Teachers attend 12 seminars (two hours each) per semester. Attendance is mandatory because participation in and contributions to the seminars are essential; teachers who miss more than two seminars are subject to losing their stipend ($1,000 each semester).
2. **Communication**: Teachers are expected to use ASL during seminar meetings.
3. **Reflective Log Assignments (RLA):** Teachers are expected to complete the reading assignments and type reflective log assignments before weekly seminars, share individual responses, and participate in weekly reflective activities.

- Reflective log assignments are completed for 12 seminars this semester; these logs express individuals' responses to the readings, topics discussed in seminars, and/or experiences that teachers have had in their classrooms. Log entries are used as a basis for group discussion, serve as a written record of individuals' thinking, and provide data for research purposes and dissemination of successful strategies of language assessment and teaching.
- Teachers are expected to keep all completed reflective log assignments in a binder throughout the year for documentation of professional development.
- It is critical that reflective log assignments be turned in on time for effective participation and for research purposes.

4. **Videotaping:** One 15 to 20-minute videotape by each teacher is required. These videotapes are utilized for a variety of functions in order to fulfill the requirements of the Star Schools project. For Level 3, teachers can videotape a sample lesson using any of the methods (Livingston's, 1997 interpretation strategies) discussed during seminar. It is critical that teachers describe what they are doing and why they chose this method. Teachers can use these videotapes for self-assessment, paired viewing for peer coaching, and/or for demonstrations/presentations to professional peers.

   See Seminar 3.7. Further instructions are provided on a separate sheet.

5. **Language/Literacy Project**: This is a one-year (Levels 3 and 4) project based on applying the information participants have acquired to the assessment of language and literacy to guide the

development of instructional plans. Each participant is required to do language and literacy assessments throughout the year on two students from his/her class. Ideally, the two students should have different levels of functioning in language and literacy and remain under the participant's instruction for the entire year.

Included in the final project report will be: assessments using French's (*The Toolkit*, 1999b) Appendices A, B, C, D, and F; a summary of one student's known information; instructional plans designed for this student; and an evaluation of French's assessment tools. Further instructions are provided on a separate sheet. Participants present a brief overview (summary of one of their students) at the end of Level 4.

6. **Research Participation**: Teachers must be willing to provide documents, photographs, and/or videotapes for the purpose of data collection and analysis, publication, electronic publication, dissemination, and electronic dissemination.

Required Texts

- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment.* White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Fradd, S. H. & McGee, P. L. (1994). *Instructional assessment: An integrative approach to evaluating student performance.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- French, M. M. (1999a). *Starting with assessment: A developmental approach to deaf children's literacy.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Pre-College National Mission Programs.
- French, M. M. (1999b). *The toolkit: Appendices for starting with assessment.* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Pre-College National Mission Programs.
- Livingston, S. (1997). *Rethinking the education of deaf students: Theory and practice from a teacher's perspective.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). *Whose judgment counts? Assessing bilingual children, K-3.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Level 3 of the Star Schools Training, Fall 2000

SEMINAR 3.1

Agenda

- Preview syllabus
- Pass out self-assessment (due in one week)
- Show Stars Schools web site? [www.starschools.org/nmsd]

Reading Assignment Due

- Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). Chapter 1.
- Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). Chapter 2.
- Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). Chapter 3.
- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Part II: Classroom assessment (pp. 125-131).
- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 8.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Describe how you have conducted informal language assessments, and reflect on the usefulness of these assessments in your instruction.
2. Using Dixon-Krauss' (1996) Chapter 8 as a guide, what are some issues to consider or questions you might ask yourself when assessing culturally diverse students?

SEMINAR 3.2

Agenda

- Collect self-assessments
- Pass out instructions for Technology Profile Tool (to be completed on own within 1 week)
- Pass out instructions and describe Language/Literacy Project

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). Chapter 4.
- ❑ Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). Chapter 5.
- ❑ Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). Chapter 6.
- ❑ Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). Chapter 7.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Create a teacher self-portrait that includes a brief description of your teaching background, your philosophy of teaching and learning, and your instructional strategies. Prepare a diagram of your classroom or learning environment, and explain how the arrangement facilitates learning for your students.

SEMINAR 3.3

Agenda

- ❑ Check to make sure each participant completed the Technology Profile Tool
- ❑ Pass out Language Proficiencies form and review categories (due in two weeks)

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Livingston, S. (1997). Chapter 1.
- ❑ Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 1.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Observe and describe the use of ASL and English among staff and students at your school. Discuss your issues or concerns regarding language use for effective communication and how this impacts student learning.
2. Vygotsky (as cited in Dixon-Krauss, 1996) described intellectual development as moving from social communication to internal thought. In what ways might this theory apply to deaf children whose access to communication with family members is limited?

SEMINAR 3.4

Agenda

- ❑ Remind participants to complete the Language Proficiency form (due next seminar)
- ❑ Make sure Star Schools group picture is completed

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Fradd, S. H. & McGee, P. L. (1994). Chapter 4.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Fradd and McGee (1994, Chapter 4) stress the importance of using assessment to determine the language needs of bilingual students. How have your views changed towards students who have been labeled as having "language disorders" when considering their limited language learning opportunities?
2. Give examples of students in your school with *arrested educational development, limited opportunities for language development* or *communication disorders*. What are your suggestions to meet these students' needs? (Please do not disclose students' real names.)

SEMINAR 3.5

Agenda

- ❑ Collect Language Proficiencies forms

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Fradd, S. H. & McGee, P. L. (1994). Chapter 8.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. In what ways do you think deaf students are mislabeled as having inherent cognitive, academic, and behavioral deficits based on their academic performance? What suggestions do you have to change this situation?
2. Consider the needs of a student whose language development (English or ASL) is delayed in comparison to other students in your class. How do you change your instruction or classroom procedures to meet the language needs of that student?

SEMINAR 3.6

Agenda

- ❑ Prepare participants to do assessments using "Appendix A" (French, 1999) (on two students for their Language/Literacy Project, due at end of Level 4)

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ French, M. M. (1999a). Chapter 1.
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999a). Chapter 2.
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit,* Appendix A.
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendix A1.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

- ❑ List three activities/strategies you can use to capitalize on the use of ASL to facilitate students' English literacy development.
- ❑ Examine the "Stages of Literacy Development Checklist" ("Appendix A") with your students in mind. What information do you think this tool could provide you about your students? How would this help guide your instruction?

SEMINAR 3.7

Agenda

- ❑ Pass out and describe Videotape assignment for Level 3

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Livingston, S. (1997). Chapter 2.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. List all of the ASL interpretation strategies found in Livingston (1997), Chapter 2. Which strategies have you observed or used in your classroom? Give two examples, and describe how they were used.
2. Select an interpretation strategy from Livingston (1997), Chapter 2 that you use infrequently. Consider ways to apply that strategy in the classroom, and describe how and in what context you might use it.

SEMINAR 3.8

Agenda

- ❑ Prepare participants to do assessments using "Appendix B" (French, 1999b) (due next seminar) on the two students selected for their Language/Literacy Project

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Fradd, S.H. & McGee, P. L. (1994). Chapter 3, Section Two (pp. 129-150).
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999). *The Toolkit*, Appendix B.
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999). *The Toolkit*, Appendix B1.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Select two students to assess throughout the year for your Language/Literacy Project. Using Figure 3-4 (Fradd & McGee, 1994, p. 135) as a guide, describe the levels of ASL proficiency of the two students in your project in terms of form, function, and content.

2. Why is the ability to assess students' levels of conversational proficiency accurately important?

SEMINAR 3.9
Agenda

Reading Assignment Due
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999a). Chapter 3.
- ❑ Discuss: French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendices B & B1.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. Discuss some of the advantages and disadvantages that must be considered in implementing an assessment program that includes ASL competencies rather than using only standardized tests and placement criteria based on English competencies.
2. Assess the two students you have selected for your yearlong Language/Literacy Project using *The Toolkit*: "Appendix B" (French, 1999b), following the guidelines on page 29. Write your reaction to the usefulness of the assessment. Also, comment on what you learned about your students as a result of this assessment. Please attach a copy of the completed assessment with this reflective log assignment.

SEMINAR 3.10
Agenda
- ❑ Remind participants that Videotape assignments are due in two weeks (at Seminar 3.12)
- ❑ Prepare participants to do assessments using "Appendix C" (French, 1999b) (due next seminar) on the two students selected for their Language/Literacy Project

Reading Assignment Due
- ❑ Livingston, S. (1997). Chapter 3.
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999). *The Toolkit*, Appendix C.
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999). *The Toolkit*, Appendix E.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
1. What types of reading activities have you tried or could you try with students to make reading meaningful and less dependent on word-for-word signing?
2. How do you currently assess and determine your students' independent reading levels? Will your assessment methods change after reading "Appendix E?" (French, 1999b). Please describe.

SEMINAR 3.11
Agenda

Reading Assignment Due
- ❑ Discuss: French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendix C.

Reflective Log Assignment Due
- ❑ Using French's (1999b) "Reading Checklists" ("Appendix C"), assess the two students you have selected for your project. Write your reaction to the usefulness of the reading assessment. Also, comment on what you learned about your students as a result of this assessment. Please attach a copy of the completed assessment with this reflective log assignment.

SEMINAR 3.12:
Agenda
- ❑ Collect videotapes

Reading Assignment Due
- ❑ None

Reflective Log Assignment Due: Reflection and Evaluation

1. Based on your readings, participation in the seminars, and attempts to apply the research, theory, and assessment in your classroom, describe how this project has impacted your approach to working with deaf children.
2. List the strengths of this project and areas that need improvement.

Appendix D

Star Schools Project
A Conceptual Framework for Deaf Education:
Bilingual/ESL Approaches to English Literacy

Syllabus
Spring 2001 - Level 4

Teacher Development: An Overview

The Star Schools two-year teacher development plan provides an opportunity for teachers to use critical pedagogy as defined by Wink (2000). Critical pedagogy is a process whereby teachers "name" their beliefs, "reflect" critically on them, and then take "action." Teachers in the Star Schools training "name" traditional beliefs, critically "reflect" on them, and then "act" to implement effective practices of bilingual/ESL instruction that will enhance the achievement of deaf students in all academic classes. The overall focus is on two components of bilingual instruction: (1) a bilingual approach that involves the use of ASL and English and (2) an ESL approach that involves the exclusive use of English as a second language.

Seminar Description: Levels 3-4

In the second year, teachers participate in 48 hours of training (24 seminars/2 hours each) focusing on using assessment tools to guide their instruction of language and literacy in bilingual, deaf classrooms. Using action research, teachers explore a variety of ways to assess students' languages (ASL and English) and (English) literacy behaviors. Based on the results of these assessments, appropriate bilingual methodology is identified to meet the language and literacy needs of students.

Seminar Requirements

1. **Attendance**: Teachers attend 12 seminars (two hours each) per semester. Attendance is mandatory because participation in and contributions to the seminars are essential; teachers who miss more than two seminars are subject to losing their stipend ($1,000 each semester).
2. **Communication**: Teachers are expected to use ASL during seminar meetings.
3. **Reflective Logs Assignments (RLA):** Teachers are required to complete the reading assignments and type reflective logs before weekly seminars, share individual responses, and participate in weekly reflective activities.
   - Reflective log questions are completed for 12 seminars this semester; these logs express individuals' responses to the readings, topics discussed in seminars, and/or experiences that teachers have had in their classrooms. Log entries are used as a basis for group discussion, serve as a written record of individuals' thinking, and provide data for research purposes and dissemination of successful strategies of language assessment and teaching.
   - Teachers are expected to save all completed reflective logs throughout the year for documentation of professional development.
   - It is critical that reflective logs be turned in on time for effective participation and for research purposes.
4. **Videotape Assignment**: Each participant is required to produce a videotape of a sample lesson using bilingual methodologies (ASL and English) described by Baker (1996), Jacobson (1990), or Freeman and Freeman (1998) (e.g., preview-view-review, concurrent translation). The lesson must also incorporate the use of SMARTBoard and/or "Aspects"

used by the teacher and/or students in the classroom. A short lesson plan describing the activity and which bilingual methodology(s) were chosen to be demonstrated must accompany the videotape.

A digital camcorder is used for videotaping. This videotape is utilized for a variety of functions in order to fulfill the requirements of the Star Schools Project. Videotapes can also be used for self-assessment, paired viewing for peer coaching and/or for demonstrations/ presentations to professional peers.

5. **Language/Literacy Project**: This one-year project begins during Level 3 and culminate at the end of Level 4. Throughout the year, teachers assess two students' languages (ASL and English) and (English) literacy, applying specific assessment tools. Teachers use the assessments to guide the development of their instructional plans. (Ideally, the two students should have diverse language and literacy skills. Also, ideally, the students remain under the teacher's instruction for the entire year.)

   Participants prepare and present a final project report (summary of one of their students) at the end of Level 4. Included in the final project report are assessments using French's (*The Toolkit*, 1999b) Appendices A, B, C, D, and F; a summary of the student's known information; instructional plans designed for this student; and an evaluation of French's assessment tools. [Further instructions are provided on a separate sheet.]

Required Texts

- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Fradd, S. H. & McGee, P. L. (1994). *Instructional assessment: An integrative approach to evaluating student performance*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- French, M. M. (1999a). *Starting with assessment: A developmental approach to deaf children's literacy*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Pre-College National Mission Programs.
- French, M. M. (1999b). *The toolkit: Appendices for starting with assessment*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Pre-College National Mission Programs.
- Livingston, S. (1997). *Rethinking the education of deaf students: Theory and practice from a teacher's perspective*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Required Articles

- Jacobson, R. (1990). Allocating two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (1996). Language allocation in bilingual classrooms *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (2nd ed) (pp. 233-239). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Level 4 of the Star Schools Training, Spring 2001

SEMINAR 4.1

Agenda

- Send a typed preview to the participants when they receive their 4.1 reading assignment and RLA
- Preview Syllabus Level 4
- Have participants pass out Parent Permission letters to parents of students who have a Star Schools teacher (requesting permission to use photos and/or videotapes of students)
- Prepare participants to distribute French's (1999b) "Appendix F" to the parents of the two students for their Language/Literacy project (or to all their parents, if they prefer). Choose

the Parent Survey (Form A, B, or C) that is appropriate for each student's literacy level. [Summaries of the surveys are due at Seminar 4.6.]

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 4.
- ❑ Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 9.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Vygotsky (as cited in Dixon-Krauss, 1996) emphasizes ZPD, semiotic mediation, conceptual development, and internalization. Analyze a previous lesson or activity you have done showing how one or more of these key principles was incorporated into that situation.
2. Dixon-Krauss' (1996) Chapter 9 (p. 153) discusses the concept of mediated reading instruction, such as the use of probing questions to support comprehension. How do you mediate your students' reading? Give some specific examples.

SEMINAR 4.2

Agenda

- ❑ Take Star Schools group photo (if group is different from last semester)
- ❑ Make sure participants distributed French's "Appendix F" (French, 1999b) to the parents of the two students for their Language/Literacy project
- ❑ Inform participants that their first Classroom Technology Data form is due in two weeks
- ❑ Pass out Frequency of Technology Use forms, and ask participants to keep a running record of the frequency of their technology use

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 11.
- ❑ Jacobson, R. (1990). Allocating two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology."
- ❑ Baker, C. (1996). Language allocation in bilingual classrooms (pp. 233-239).

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Your practice of language separation in the classroom has been questioned. Justify your stance. Are there any occasions when a concurrent use of two languages might be beneficial? If so, please explain.
2. Chapter 11 in Dixon-Krauss (1996) discusses the application of technology to literacy instruction. Describe how you have incorporated the use of technology to facilitate ASL and English acquisition and learning for your deaf students. How have these applications benefited your students' language and literacy development?

SEMINAR 4.3

Agenda

- ❑ Inform participants that a typo exists (in next week's reading) on pages 74-76 of French's (1999b) *The Toolkit*; these pages are part of "Appendix D," not "Appendix E."
- ❑ Remind participants that their first Classroom Technology Data form is due next seminar
- ❑ If participants have not yet gotten back the Parent Surveys ("Appendix F") (French, 1999b) or the Parent Permission Letters, have them send out reminders to the parents
- ❑ Pass out guidelines and describe Videotape Assignment for Level 4

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Livingston, S. (1997). Chapter 4.

- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 2.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Livingston (1997, p. 112) strongly believes it is not beneficial to compare the grammar of English and ASL as an instructional technique. What are your thoughts and teaching practices in relation to this idea?
2. How do you use the mediation model described in Dixon-Krauss (1996, Figure 1.2, p. 21) to maximize your students' reading and writing experiences?

SEMINAR 4.4

Agenda

- Collect participants' first Classroom Technology Data forms
- Check to make sure participants are keeping a running record of the frequency of their technology use by using the Frequency of Technology Use form
- Remind participants that Parent Survey ("Appendix F")(French, 1999b) summaries are due in two weeks
- Inform participants that Parent Permission forms will be collected at the next seminar
- Review requirements for Language/Literacy Project
- Inform participants that writing samples of their two students (for their Language/Literacy project) are needed for next week's RLA
- Train participants on how to use a scanner to send that file through email (required in next week's RLA)

Reading Assignment Due

- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 6.
- French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendix D.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. It is important to reflect on the ultimate purpose for writing: to communicate meaningfully with another person. With this purpose in mind, discuss your views about learning print conventions such as punctuation, syntax, and spelling. How can you make learning these skills a meaningful task for children?
2. Discuss how gathering information about your students' current writing levels using "Appendix D: Kendall Writing Levels" (French, 1999b) helps you plan instruction to meet individual students' needs more effectively.

SEMINAR 4.5

Agenda

- Collect Parent Permission letters
- Remind participants that Parent Survey ("Appendix F") (French, 1999b) summaries are due at the next seminar
- Inform participants that completed Student Surveys ("Appendix F") from their two students are required for next week's RLA. Have them choose which survey (Form "A" or "B") is appropriate for each student.

Reading Assignment Due

- Livingston, S. (1997). Chapter 5.
- Discuss: French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendix D.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Describe one (or more) activity(s) in which you have integrated ASL, reading, writing, and fingerspelling.
2. Collect (or examine already collected) writing samples from your two students (for your Language/Literacy project). Review these writing samples. Identify these students' writing levels using "Appendix D: Kendall Writing Levels" (French, 1999b). Choose one student and develop a mini-lesson that addresses a specific need in this student's writing development. Attach scanned copies of these writing samples to the reflective log.

SEMINAR 4.6

Agenda

- Collect any late Parent Permission letters
- Inform participants that their second (or more) Classroom Technology Data form is due in two weeks

Reading Assignment Due

- French, M. M. (1999a). Chapter 4.
- French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendix F.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. What are the current grading/assessment approaches in your school and in your classroom? How can a collaborative approach be applied to assessment at your school?
2. Summarize the results of the completed "Parent Surveys" and "Student Surveys" (French, 1999b) "Appendix F") of your two students. Reflect on the impact this information will have on your teaching. Be ready to share your findings at the seminar.

SEMINAR 4.7

Agenda

- Check to make sure participants are continuing to keep a running record of the frequency of their technology use by using the Frequency of Technology Use form
  - Remind participants that their second Classroom Technology Data form is due next seminar
  - Either this week or next, start training participants to use PowerPoint in order to present their Language/Literacy Projects at Seminar 4.11

Reading Assignment Due

- Fradd, S. H. & McGee, P. L. (1994). Chapter 7.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. French (1999a, Chapter 4) and Fradd & McGee (1994, Chapter 7) described a collaborative approach to assessment. Describe how you are using this approach in your own assessment practices. How could you improve upon your present practice?
2. Considering the importance of obtaining measures of a deaf student's academic achievement in English and ASL, discuss how you are obtaining some of these measurements in your educational setting. How do you collaborate with others to accomplish this?

SEMINAR 4.8

Agenda

- ❑ Collect participants' second (or more) Classroom Technology Data forms
- ❑ Check on progress of participants' Videotape Projects, due at Seminar 4.12
- ❑ Start, or continue, PowerPoint training for participants

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ French, M. M. (1999). Chapter 5.
- ❑ Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). Chapter 10.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

Chapter 10 from Dixon-Krauss (1996) discussed the framework for using portfolios to mediate instruction and assessment. French (1999a) described the relevance and relationships among the three levels of assessment and record keeping: student level, teacher level, and program level.

1. Discuss the strengths and needed improvements of these levels of assessment at your school.
2. Explain your current level of implementation of a comprehensive assessment program and how you plan to expand upon it.

SEMINAR 4.9

Agenda

- ❑ Remind participants that Language/Literacy Projects are due in two weeks
- ❑ Pass out Self-assessments, Language Proficiency forms, and Technology Profile Tool instructions, and inform participants to complete these by Seminar 4.12
- ❑ Make sure participants are able to use PowerPoint to present their Language/Literacy Projects due at Seminar 4.11

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ French, M. M. (1999a). Chapter 6.
- ❑ French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendix G.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. You have been doing ongoing assessment on two students for your project using *The Toolkit* (French, 1999). How have the assessment results of the students' conversational ASL and reading and writing skills influenced your instruction for these students?
2. Review the "Guidelines for Planning and Instruction for Literacy" (French, 1999a, pp. 161-176) and provide some personal reflections about how you could apply at least two of these guidelines.

SEMINAR 4.10

Agenda

- ❑ Remind participants that these are due in two weeks:
  - Videotape Project and accompanying Lesson Plan
  - Third (or more) Classroom Technology Data form(s)
  - Frequency of Technology Use form
  - Self-assessment
  - Language Proficiency form
  - Technology Tool Profile
- ❑ Remind participants that PowerPoint presentations of their Language/Literacy Project are due next seminar

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ Fradd, S. H. & McGee, P. L. (1994). Chapter 9.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Describe what you are doing to establish and maintain clear communication with the parents of your two students regarding their current levels of functioning and the school's ongoing efforts to meet their needs, both socially and academically. How could you enhance your communication with parents?
2. Review the assessments you have completed for your Language/Literacy Project. Referring to Fradd and McGee's (1994) Chapter 9, describe how this information guides your instruction.

SEMINAR 4.11

Agenda

- ❑ Check for missing RLAs, ratings of readings, and other assignments, and remind participants that all these are due at the next seminar
- ❑ Collect participants' Language/Literacy Projects
- ❑ Remind participants that these are due at next seminar:
  - Videotape Project and accompanying Lesson Plan
  - Third (or more) Classroom Technology Data form(s)
  - Frequency of Technology Use forms
  - Self-assessment
  - Language Proficiency form
  - Technology Tool Profile

Reading Assignment

- ❑ Review: French, M. M. (1999a). *The Toolkit*, Appendix A.
- ❑ Review: French, M. M. (1999b). *The Toolkit*, Appendix A1.

Reflective Log Assignment Due

1. Assess your two students using French's (1999b) "Stages of Literacy Development Checklist" ("Appendix A") and select one student to focus on for your Language/Literacy Project. Write up your Language/Literacy Project to be submitted next week.
2. Prepare a PowerPoint presentation of your Language/Literacy Project (for the student you have selected) to be presented during seminar.

SEMINAR 4.12: Reflection and Evaluation

Agenda

- ❑ Collect each participant's:
  - Videotape Project & accompanying Lesson Plan
  - Third (or more) Classroom Technology Data form(s)
  - Frequency of Technology Use form
  - Self-assessment
  - Language Proficiency form
- ❑ Make sure each participant has completed the Technology Tool Profile
- ❑ Celebrate and pass out Star Schools Certificates

Reading Assignment Due

- ❑ none

Reflective Log Assignment Due: Reflection and Evaluation

1. Based on your readings; participation in the seminars; and attempts to apply the research, theory, and assessments in your classroom, describe how this project has had an impact on your approach to working with deaf children.

List the strengths of this project and areas that need improvement.

References

Andrews, J. & Nover, S. (2000 June). *Critical background variables omitted in comparison study: An appeal to the state auditor to reanalyze the data*. Letter to the Editor submitted to the Deaf Carolina News (www.deafcarolina.com).

Baker C. (2001). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (3nd ed)*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C, (1996). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (2nd ed)*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Bruton, H. & Raimondo, B. (1999). *Can teaching ASL be construed as "child abuse? "* [WWW document]. URL http://www.deafcarolina.com.

Campbell, R. (April, 2000). *Performance Audit: Department of Health and Human Services*. Division of Services For the Deaf and Hard of Hearing. Raleigh, NC.

Chamberlain, C., Morford, J., & Mayberry, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Language acquisition by eye*. Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the classroom: Mediated literacy instruction and assessment*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Easterbrooks, S., & Baker, S. (2002). *Language learning in children who are deaf and hard of hearing: Multiple pathways*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Emerton, R. G. (1998). Marginality, biculturalism, and social identity of deaf people. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp.136-145). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Finton, L. (1998). Living in a bilingual-bicultural family. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 258-271). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fradd, S. and McGee, P. (1994). *Instructional assessment: An integrative approach to evaluating student performance*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). *ESL/EFL teaching: Principles for success*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

French, M. (1999a). *Starting with assessment: A developmental approach to deaf children's literacy*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Pre-College National Mission Programs.

French, M. (1999b). *The toolkit: Appendices for starting the assessment*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University, Pre-College National Mission Programs.

Graney, S. (1997). *Where does speech fit in?: Spoken English in a bilingual context*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Pre-College National Mission Programs.

Grosjean, E. (2000 Winter). The right of the deaf child to grow up bilingual. *The Endeavor*, (28-31).

Grosjean, F. (1998). Living with two languages and two cultures. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 20-37). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hakuta, J., & Mostafapoour, E. F. (1998). In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and Language Diversity and the Deaf Experience* (pp. 38-50). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamers, J. (1998). Cognitive and language development of bilingual children. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 51-75). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hansen, B. (1994). Trends in the progress toward bilingual education for deaf children in Denmark. In C. Erting, R. Johnson, D. Smith, & B. Snider (Eds.), *The Deaf way: Perspectives from the International Conference on Deaf Culture*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press.

Jacobson, R. (1990). Allocating the two languages as a key feature of a bilingual methodology. In R. Jacobson & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling* (pp. 3-17). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Knight, P., & Swanwick, R. (1999). *The care and education of a deaf child*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Lane, H., Hoffmeister, R., & Bahan, B. (1996). *A journey into the deaf-world*. San Diego: DawnSign Press.

Livingston, S. (1997). *Rethinking the education of deaf students: Theory and practice from a teacher's perspective*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Mahshie, S. (1997). *A first language: Whose choice is it?* Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Pre-College National Mission Programs.

Mather, S. M., & Mitchell, R. (1993). Communication abuse: A sociolinguistic perspective. In B. Snider (Ed.), *Conference proceedings: Post Milan ASL & English literacy: Issues, trends, & research* (pp. 117-134). Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University, College of Continuing Education.

McLaughlin, B. (1995). *Fostering second language development in young children: Principles and practices* (Educational Practice Report No. 14). Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 932)

Moores, D. (2000). *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles, and practices*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Muhlke, M. (2000 Winter). The right to language and linguistic development: Deafness from a human rights perspective. *Virginia Journal of International Law, 40*, 705-760.

Nover, S. (1995). Politics and language: American Sign Language and English in deaf education. In C. Lucas (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics in deaf communities* (pp. 109-163).

Nover, S. (2000). *History of language planning in deaf education*: The 19th century. Unpublished doctoral dissertaton. University of Arizona, Tucson.

Nover, S., & Andrews, J. (1998). *Critical pedagogy in deaf education: Bilingual methodology and staff development: Year 1 (1997-1998)*. Santa Fe, New Mexico School for the Deaf.

Nover, S., & Andrews, J. (1999). *Critical pedagogy in deaf education: Bilingual methodology and staff development: Year 2 (1998-1999)*. Santa Fe, New Mexico School for the Deaf.

Nover, S., & Andrews, J. (2000). *Critical pedagogy in deaf education: Teachers, reflections on creating a bilingual classroom for deaf learners: Year 3 (1999-2000).* Santa Fe, New Mexico School for the Deaf.

Nover, S., & Moll, L. (1997). Cultural mediation of deaf cognition. In M. P. Moeller & B. Shick (Eds.), *Deafness and diversity: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 39-50). Omaha, NE: Boys Town National Research Hospital.

Nover, S., Christensen, K., & Cheng, L. (1998). Development of ASL and English competence for learners who are deaf. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18* (4), 61-72.

Padden, C. (1998). Early bilingual lives of deaf children. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 99-116). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Padden, C., & Ramsey, C. (1998). Reading ability in signing deaf children. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18* (4), 30-46.

Padden, C.A. (1998). From the cultural to the bicultural: The modern deaf community. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience* (pp. 79-98). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Parasnis, I. (Ed.). (1996). *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pickersgill, M. (1998). Bilingualism- Current policy and practice. In S. Gregory, P. Knight, W. McCracken, S. Powers, & L. Watson (Eds.), *Issues in deaf education* (pp. 89-97). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Prinz, P., & Strong, M. (1998). ASL proficiency and English literacy within a bilingual deaf education model of instruction. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18* (4), 47-60.

Quigley, S. & Kretchmer, R. (1986). The education of deaf children: Issues, theory and practice. Baltimore, MD: University Park.

Rogers, E. (1983). *Diffusions of innovations.* New York: The Free Press.

Rosen, S., & Virnig, S. (1997, May). *A synopsis of the Bill of Rights for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children* [WWW document]. URL http://nad.policy.net/proactive/newsroom/release.vtml?id=17960.

Schirmer, B. (2000). *Language and literacy development in children who are deaf.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Shepard, L. (2000a). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher, 29* (7), 4-14.

Shepard, L. (2000b). *The role of classroom assessment in teaching and learning.* Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Washington, DC.

Singleton, J., Supalla, S., Litchfield, S., and Schley, S. (1998). From sign to word: Considering modality constraints in ASL/English. *Topics in Language Disorders, 18* (4), 16-29.

Stefanakis, E. H. (1998). *Whose judgment counts? Assessing bilingual children, K-3.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Strong, M. (1995). A review of bilingual/bicultural programs for deaf children in North America. *American Annals of the Deaf, 140* (2), 84-90.

Vernon, M. & Andrews, J. (1990). *The psychology of deafness: Understanding deaf and hard-of-hearing people.* White Plain, NY: Longman.

Wink, J. (2000). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world (p. 54-55).* New York: Longman.

Stephen M. Nover, Star Schools Project Director
Center for ASL/English Bilingual Education and Research
New Mexico School for the Deaf
1060 Cerrillos Road
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505
V/TDD: (505) 827-6739
FAX: (505) 827-6684
E-Mail: steve.nover@nmsd.k12.nm.us

Cover design: Center for the Application of Information Technologies at Western Illinois University

Star Schools Project Report No. 4

CRITICAL PEDAGOGY IN DEAF EDUCATION: TEACHERS' REFLECTIONS ON IMPLEMENTING ASL/ENGLISH BILINGUAL METHODOLGY AND LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT FOR DEAF LEARNERS

ISBN 0-9668769-4-6

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☐ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☑ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").